

WE – TODAY’S AND TOMORROW’S – PEOPLE OF THE UNITED WORLD: RETHINKING CAPITALISM FOR INTERGENERATIONAL JUSTICE IN THE FIN-DE-MILLÉNAIRE

Julia M. Puaschunder *

* The New School for Social Research, Department of Economics, the Schwartz Center for Economic Policy Analysis;
Columbia University in the City of New York, USA

Abstract

How to cite this paper:

Puaschunder, J. (2017). We – today’s and tomorrow’s – people of the united world: rethinking capitalism for intergenerational justice in the fin-de-millénaire. *Corporate Governance and Sustainability Review*, 1(2), 30-34. <http://doi.org/10.22495/cgsrv1i2p4>

Copyright © 2017 by Virtus Interpress All rights reserved

The Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) will be activated starting from November, 2018 followed by transfer of the copyright to the Authors

ISSN Online: 2519-898X

ISSN Print: 2519-8971

Received: 24.07.2017

Accepted: 15.10.2017

JEL Classification: H12, H6, Q01, Q5

DOI: 10.22495/cgsrv1i2p4

Globalization leveraged pressure on contemporary society. Today’s most pressing social dilemmas regarding climate change, overindebtedness and aging Western world populations demand rethinking capitalism. Understanding the bounds of capitalism to avoid ethical downfalls beyond the control of singular nation states infringing on intergenerational equity – the fairness to provide an at least as favorable standard of living to future generations as enjoyed today – has become a blatant demand. This article captures the human natural drive towards intergenerational fairness in order to retrieve information on how to implement intergenerational justice. Based on the idea of intergenerational equity as a natural behavioral law, the following paper theoretically outlines the current societal demand for eternal equity and proposes intergenerational justice theories. Intertemporal connectedness and interaction of overlapping generations enables intergenerational benefits transfers and burden sharing. Social mobility within networks comprised of different generations is enhanced through social upward movement opportunities. In addition, meritocracy helps alleviate intergenerational inequality. Describing intergenerational care as something natural that has been practiced ever since helps spearhead interdisciplinary endeavours to solve contemporary predicaments between overlapping generations. Exploring intergenerational opportunities is targeted at innovatively guiding the implementation of justice over time and between generations. Strengthening financial social responsibility, social welfare and environmental protection through future-oriented and socially responsible economic market approaches of capitalism in the 21st century is aimed at alleviating predictable economic, social and environmental crises to ensure a future sustainable humankind for this generation and the following.

Keywords: Sustainable Humankind, Environmental Protection, Intergenerational Justice

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Fin-de-millénaire: End of capitalism or the beginning of the future?

We live in interesting times. From the sixteenth century age of enlightenment, science and technology remarkably revolutionized the world. Followed by the eighteenth century industrialization, technological advancements, technical inventions

and capital accumulation leveraged the standard of living for mankind. The post-WWII economic boom heralded golden years of socio-economic advancement and economic capital growth outpacing every measure previous ages had known.

Though looking back to an epoch of enormous economic progress in the 20th century; the improvement of living conditions seemed to be slowed from the turn of the millennium on. The era of globalization, featuring complex interconnections

and transactions faster than ever before in history, appeared to hold emergent systemic risks (Sandbrook, Edelman, Heller & Teichmann, 2007). What happens in one part of the world today, impacts around the globe (Foley, 2015). The global interconnectedness imposing dangers creates a need for framework conditions securing from negative consequences emerging from the new web of social, ecological and fundamental transfers on a grand scale (Centeno & Tham, 2013; Klein, 2014).

As a consequence of complex economic interconnections, market prosperity burst with the 2008/09 monetary downturn having evolved from individual ethical failures amalgamating into collective downfalls (Streeck, 2011). We now not only suffer from the painful readjustment between economic fluctuations and whimsical market movements in the finance world. Market failures also having been compensated by the public results in an unprecedented overindebtedness of the Western world. Budget crises around the world led to austerity plans triggering an economic climate of stagnation, federal spending constraints and prospected social welfare decline for decades to come (Ghilarducci & McGahey, 2013). Tomorrow's children may not have the same standard of living as aging Western World populations may experience economies struck by high unemployment coupled with governmental overindebtedness.

In the aftermath of the 2008/09 World Financial Crisis, the finance sector is under scrutiny as for having made fast capital at the expense of the real economy. Since 2009 financial institutions are publicly pressured to justify their social impacts and responsibility. Economic pessimism grows in the belief that the current equity imbalances will be long term and cause the next generation being worse off. The destruction of assets and degrading of capital values led to a devaluation of personal property. What followed was the unorganized uprising in the wake of an uncontrolled clash of realities. Distributive equity claims and the call for equality of opportunities rose in economically-troubled areas. Direct democracy protests culminated in the Occupy Wall Street movement. People having lost trust in banking systems started to think about future obligations and more than ever before now strive to pass on an as favorable standard of living to future generations.

In the eye of our children having to pay for our current economic recovery, we are now taking from future generations. Not only do we live at their expenses, the youth also not quite has the same opportunities as their parents enjoyed. Rising prices take away wealth accumulation prospects and austerity plans diminish access to social welfare. Missing budgetary resources result in governmental education cuts as for the lagged impact and accountability - yet the societal outcomes are crucial to the people who experience hope for a better future through education opportunities vanishing. Restricted access to education breeds social immobility. 'Born poor, die poor' becomes reality in the Western world and an intergenerational equity constraint, when European students have to pay for their tuition while generations before were granted free access to knowledge.

In addition employment opportunities for this generation are more limited than for prior generations. Within Europe, in 2012 the overall EU

unemployment rate stood at 11.4 % but featured a distorted pattern. Based on the EU accession of 2004, old 'core' member states (EU 15) and EU-2004 accession 'periphery' member states (EU12) differ on employment significantly. When comparing core with peripheral countries, we find in the core a relatively lower mean unemployment rate of 7.54%³⁰ compared to 15.04% mean unemployment in the periphery³¹ (Puaschunder, 2016b).

Unemployment hits the European youth the hardest. In many parts of the Western world, it has become almost impossible to get a job for the young - for instance, in 2011 the Spanish youth faced an up to 65% high unemployment rate. As of January 2013, Spain's unemployment rate was 26.2% and for those under 25 years the rate remained around 60% (Eurostat, 2015). Greece featured an overall unemployment rate of 27% and 59% for individuals less than 25 years. Of the under the age of 25 years workforce, 23.7% were unemployed in the Eurozone and 21.9% in the overall EU as of November 2014. The youth in the core EU faces a mean unemployment rate of 18.3%³², while the periphery youth stands at 29.1%³³ as of November 2014. Long-term unemployment is highest in the Slovak Republic, Germany (with former East Germany accounting for high unemployment as ever since the reunification in 1990, the unemployment rate in the East has been almost twice that of the West), Poland and Greece.

There is also an explosion of unpaid internships that further breed social inequality as the market turns the workforce to having to afford to work. Countries with current high unemployment like Spain, Italy and Ireland, in which the youth turns to the black market labor, leave the government with lower taxation revenues and the young without perspectives and trust in their government. Unemployment not only opens generation gaps. Negative socio-psychological consequences arise out of fear of the future which may become a self-fulfilling proficiency of economic depression.

Young people see their prospects vanishing and are left without hope for a better future when they experience their decision making not being included in the political will. The young struggle with the anonymity of governmental support and their experienced helplessness drives anger. Starting in the fall of 2009 in Vienna, the 'Uni brennt' ('University is burning') student occupation of the University of Vienna's Audimax advocated for social equality, access to education and minority empowerment. The protests lasted for months and inflamed protests all over Europe. In the face of social responsibility declines, protests fueled to release societal tensions. Spain's youth suffering from over 65% unemployment and fading future perspectives rebelled during the summer of 2011,

³⁰ based on Austria 4.9%, Belgium 8.8%, Czech Republic 7.1%, Denmark 6%, Finland 8.1%, France 10.2%, Germany 5.3%, Hungary 8.1%, Italy 13%, Luxembourg 4.9%, Malta 6.4%, Netherlands 8.3%, Sweden 8.1%, and UK 6.3% as of 2013 and 2014.

³¹ based on Bulgaria 11.6%, Croatia 21.6%, Cyprus 17.4%, Estonia 10.9%, Greece 27.9%, Ireland 10.7%, Latvia 9.8%, Lithuania 12.4%, Poland 10.3%, Portugal 16.8%, Romania 7.3%, Slovakia 14.4%, Slovenia 13.1%, Spain 26.3% as of 2013.

³² based on core countries Austria 8.9%, Belgium 21.6%, Czech Republic 15.6%, Denmark 11.4%, Finland 20.7%, France 25.4%, Germany 7.4%, Hungary 19.8%, Italy 43.9%, Luxembourg 18.4%, Malta 13.5%, Netherlands 9.7%, Sweden 23%, and UK 16.3%.

³³ periphery countries Bulgaria 21.4%, Croatia 45.5%, Cyprus 34.8%, Estonia 13.9%, Greece 49.8%, Ireland 21.8%, Latvia 20.3%, Lithuania 15.5%, Poland 23.2%, Portugal 34.5%, Romania 23.3%, Slovakia 29.2%, Slovenia 20.4%, and Spain 53.5% national unemployment rates.

which spread protests all across Europe supported by new media tools - like blogs, Facebook and Twitter. The popular media has been puzzled in describing a uniting theme of the contemporary populace on the street. With the young going on the streets for protests in the Western world, unprecedented intergenerational imbalances, one may argue, are driving this trend.

Exhausted twin deficits of current and capital account put extraordinary burdens on the upcoming generation. An American child, for instance, is born into 59,000 USD debt per capita and a US taxpayer owes more 160,000 USD share of governmental debt with trends predicting a grim outlook. In the end, the children of tomorrow will not only pay the price for our currently taken up debt. Placing the olders' current pension consumption payment obligations onto the young is problematic as pensions are usually not allocated towards future investments - such as infrastructure or education, which would build future societal assets in the long run and make future generations richer. The debt burden gains weight when considering the societal trend of a shrinking Western world population. As the problem appears as a long-term crisis, unemployment will rise, individual prosperity decline and social welfare standards degrade.

The standard of living we have today will have to be maintained by a demographically shrinking body of young, who will have to uphold the current way of life. In the aging Western population, we see the workforce shifting to pensioners. Western, and in particular European pension systems, becomes unfeasible with current debt accumulation to pay out pensions, which breed inequality in European low-inheritance tax countries. Rising social security expenditures due to medical advancements and pension payments growing with an enlarging body of retired already cause frictions in the social compound. A pension system reform is insofar complicated as the age pyramid has already tipped in most European countries featuring more receivers in the voting booth than payers. And in a loss-averse world, cutting given promises equals political suicide. The European fiscal union requiring transnational financial bail-outs will breed inequality in legally differing tax and pension territories. 58% of social protection spending is based in Europe. For instance, why should a 55-year old early pensioner in one country receive tax subsidies enabled by a 65-year employee in another region of the EU?

While monetary values can be rebuilt, capitalism's myopic *short-term* profit systematically ignores the broader and longer-ranging implications of its actions and externalities, which results in irreversible ecological destruction (Boscov-Ellen, 2015). Contemporary capitalism raises ecological "limits" to growth and environment concerns in the eye of unsustainable resource consumption and increasing man-made climate change (Zaretsky, 2015). Regarding climate change and ecologic sustainability, the world appears more vulnerable than ever before. In 2010 we hit the highest energy resource consumption in the 40-year recording of sustainability. Climate change is going to be the greatest human challenge of the 21st century touching on all human rights given the potential massive and widespread impacts creating irreversible lock-ins for future generations and injustice over time. The destruction of the

environment is the most sustainable peril of globalization.

Overall, not only an aging Western world population and the 2008/09 World Financial Crisis but also climate changes pressure our children to come. In a climate of economic downturn and growing burden to support the elderly, our children will also face declining biodiversity and ecological environmental changes in the wake of climate change.

The following article therefore targets at promoting the idea of intergenerational equity and intertemporal harmoniously balanced transfer models. Intergenerationally responsible leadership is built on the idea that corporate executives have an obligation to incorporate needs of far-ranging constituents, including future generations.

This paper is designed to help readers understand intergenerational equity leadership from different angles. It is aimed at helping people who are motivated to learn about contemporary intergenerational equity constraints in the domains of finance, economics and ecologic sustainability. A broad readership comprising of leaders from academia, the legislative branch and public policy making, who consider implementing intergenerational balance, should be engaged. Intergenerational equity implementation recommendations are given to serve academics, public executives and private sector representatives. The topic under scrutiny, intergenerational equity, is outlined by the two core issues of (1) capitalism's myopic short-termism angle and (2) climate change and ecologic sustainability.

Investigating intergenerational constraints from a global governance perspective helps understanding the impact of public and private sector contributions on intergenerational fairness. Studying public welfare problems as well as financial market predicaments and environmental constraints concurrently elucidates similarities and differences of public and private sector approaches to ensure intergenerational equity. Mapping intergenerational equity throughout the world allows international comparisons of public and private sector intergenerational responsibility approaches in order to derive multi-faceted success factors for a concerted implementation of intergenerational responsibility. Paying attention to the 2008/09 World Financial Crisis provides a unique snapshot of socio-economic changes implied by a financial turmoil and helps portraying crises as opportunity for ingraining ethicality throughout society. In sum understanding the socio-dynamics of intergenerational equity will serve as a prerequisite for an intergenerationally harmonious and a future sustainable humanity.

1.2. The call for intergenerational responsibility

This unprecedented intergenerational kink heralds an overall call for intergenerational equity - the fairness to provide an at least as favorable standard of living as enjoyed today. As we realize that our children may not have the same chances as we do, we must strive for global equity over time. The global challenge is thereby to find sustainable, qualitative economic growth in harmony with human rights of development over time.

The idea of eternal equity addresses justice over time. As an implicit contract and transfer inbetween living and future generations, intergenerational equity not only reduces unfairness for future world inhabitants who are born in less favorable environmental conditions than their parents. Intergenerational equity also ensures future infrastructure, equal opportunities over time and constant access to social welfare for the youth. Intergenerational equity grants a favorable climate between generations and averts frictions arising from austerity plans, diminishing social welfare standards and declining environmental prosperity. Intergenerational equity avoids discriminating against future generations on the basis of remoteness of the time at which they will live.

While intergenerational equity is as old as humankind - the 2008/09 World Financial Crisis, an aging industrialized world and climate change have put a new stance on the dimensions of overindebtedness and irreversible destruction of future potential, which may serve as an explanation for the 2011 occupy Zeitgeist reclaiming public space as a symbol for common goods (Fraser, 2014; Nafeez, 2013). In the eye of leaving next generations' debt, unfeasible social welfare and sustainability threats, intergenerational equity is an urgent topic of concern that opens windows of opportunity to implement financial social responsibility, social pension reform and ecologic sustainability (Magdoff & Foster, 2010).

The complex challenges ahead will require heightened attention to future generations' well-being. In the eye of an unprecedented intergenerational equity kink, it has become economically efficient to think about the next generation and future world-inhabitants' living conditions. The prevailing world depression, the enormous anomaly of unemployment and liquidity constraints not only make instant economic market stimulus necessary but also the demographic shifts demand for foresighted governance.

While the wish for intergenerational equity has sparked, we currently lack a codified legal framework on intergenerational fairness as well as an economic understanding of feasible intergenerational equity models that accurately pay attention to future generations. To measure intergenerational equity, we will have to estimate future developments. Intergenerational equity will require discounting of future events by politicians, policy makers and private individuals who will have to factor in future-orientation and social responsibility in current decisions. Future world inhabitants must be put into the focus of today's choices by shifting the current wealth of the elderly to save for future generations and put sustainable governance in place. We may also have to curb our consumption rates or find alternative climate justice financing strategies to conscientiously transmit the earth's resources to future generations or find alternatives of financing climate change abatement (Puaschunder, 2016a).

The outlined intergenerational equity constraints are complex and their solution interdependent. As the present crisis has exposed the weaknesses of orthodox economic theory, novel heterodox economic thinking is demanded (Shaikh, 2013). The current world economy opens

possibilities but also threatens future generations. While economic growth may aid a soft landing with current liquidity constraints, booming markets also imply heightened energy consumption trading-off from the ecologic quality of life on the long run. Entrepreneurial solutions may ease the overindebtedness, but innovation in the medical sector will explode medical care expenditures for pensioners - especially in social welfare territories obeying to mandatorily provide the best medical aid available to their citizens. Governments must breed hope through forward-looking strategies in the eye of radical austerity cuts and unemployment gaps to take away people's fear of the future. Policy makers are pressured to revise social services and raise the retirement age in industrialized economies.

Eternal equity has always been lived within the family compound and practiced in the wake of humane fairness notions. The human-imbued wish to provide an at least as favorable standard of living to our children stems from evolutionary, social and religious values. Ignorance regarding intergenerational concerns naturally feels wrong and the hegemony of the 'now' appears like a sin on future generations. Not being intergenerationally conscientious puts offspring at stake and detaches people from their environment. Understanding intergenerational conscientiousness as a natural behavioral humane-imbued law will help integrating future conditions in today's decision making (Luf, 2011).

Building on Rawls' procedural justice, intergenerational equity will ensure fairness between generations based on future orientation and social responsibility for future generations. Pursuing intergenerational equity in the wish to provide a decent standard of living for the upcoming young can be enabled by a mutual transfer between old and young. Justice can be sought in future outlooks, humane reflexivity and globalized solidarity enabling that one generation does not overconsume at the expense of future generations. Financial Social Responsibility will help that the current generation is not spending the money of tomorrow's children or takes up debt to be paid by future children. Generations passing on to the future will feature age-attentively redistributed wealth, investments for young and respect for future generations' resource consumption needs.

When considering the current Western world overindebtedness, social welfare prospects and climate change, we are already behind the schedule when it comes to fundamental foresighted preparedness. The following work thus targets at contributing to eternal equity. Contemporary unprecedented intergenerational equity constraints, such as overindebtedness, pension reform of an aging Western world population as well as climate change demand for implementing intergenerational fairness. A human-imbued drive towards intergenerational conscientiousness comprising of social responsibility and future-orientation is argued as the basis of legal foundations, public policies and regulation that enables intergenerational justice over time. In addition, eternal equity can also echo in bottom-up participatory democracy and social representations of care between generations (Puaschunder, 2016c).

2. INTERGENERATIONAL JUSTICE IMPLEMENTATION

Globalization led to unprecedented intergenerational equity imbalances regarding climate change, overindebtedness in the aftermath of the 2008/09 World Financial Crisis as well as pension reform needs of an aging Western World population (Puaschunder, 2015). In the eye of current intergenerational concerns, the study of global intergenerational balances leverages into a necessary and blatant demand but is up-to-date limited in order to implement intergenerational fairness. Intergenerational justice breeds in the social compound in the wake of intergenerational transfers within overlapping generations' networks through intergenerational connectedness and social interaction but also arises through intergenerational mobility enabled through intertemporal opportunities and meritocracy.

2.1. Intergenerational connectedness

2.1.1. Overlapping generations' network

In overlapping generations' models, representative agents live a finite time overlapping with another agent's lifespan. Individual's lifetime utility is a function of consumption in all periods (Allais, 1947). Individuals live for two periods as young (period 1) and old (period 2). In every period there are old and young living together and there is constant population growth (Samuelson, 1958). Individuals receive an endowment of goods at birth that endures for one period, whereas money endures for multiple periods (Diamond, 1965). The endowment of goods throughout lifetime depends on the endowment of labor creating real income while people are young and the natural endowment of inheritance based on ancestry's wealth and transfers. The model allows for oversavings of the old generation and the young generation can accept money from the previous old in exchange for consumption with the prospect of using that money to purchase consumption when they are the old generation. For intergenerational improvement of opportunities over time, concurrently living generations have to engage in social interaction.

2.1.2. Social interaction theory

Social environment and human capital formation are necessary yet overlooked factors determining intergenerational advancement (Borjas, 1995). Social environments lead to the agglomeration of opportunities through social interaction but also create poverty trap holes that individuals cannot leave (Durlauf, 2001; Goldberger, 1989). Intergenerational stickiness was found in housing zones determining education, marital fulfilledness, and wages over time (Chetty, Hendren & Katz, 2015; Osborne, 2002). The environment during childhood appears as key determinant of an individual's long-term prospects of societal status (Bouchard & McGue, 1981; Chetty et al., 2015). The driver to break intergenerational persistence through intergenerational mobility lies in intertemporal merit-based advancement opportunities.

2.2. Intergenerational mobility

2.2.1. Intertemporal opportunities

Thomas Piketty's (2014) *Capital in the 21st Century* is about societal inequality. The trend of the rise of the super-rich that can be traced back in power, resources, taxes, financial markets and the social dynamics of the top 1 % raises questions regarding social mobility (Volscho & Kelly, 2012). Meritocratic intergenerational mobility is at the core of equitable societies (Arrow, Bowles & Durlauf, 1999).

Inequality persists in immobile societies as indicated by the $r=.56, 88, p<.05$ correlation between inequality and intergenerational wage persistence (OECD, 2010). Intergenerational mobility is a feature of equal societies across countries.³⁴ Inequality diminishes when people improve their societal placement from one generation to the next (Cooper, Durlauf & Johnson, 1994). Intergenerational equity grants equity of chances - not outcomes, which should be merit based - over time for this generation and the following (Loehlin & Nichols, 1976). If individuals cannot advance based on their education, work and natural skills, then their societal status is determined by their parents' and ancestors' wealth, income and networks (Becker, 1988; Bowles, Gintis & Osborne, 2008; Menchik, 1979). Individual ability and ambition appear as fairer determinants of one's place in the social order and, from an economic perspective, merit-based allocations appear more productive over time as for being based on long-term intelligence and values such as need for achievement (Arrow et al., 2015; Becker & Tomes, 1986).

Yet inequality persists in immobile societies (Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992). An OECD (2010) Economic Policy Reform Report outlines a $r=.56, 88, p<.05$ correlation between inequality and intergenerational wage persistence, measured by the gap between the estimated wage of an individual whose father had achieved tertiary education and the wage of an individual whose father had below upper secondary education (Solon, 1992; Solon, 1999; Taubman, 1976).

2.2.2. Meritocracy

Across countries intergenerational mobility is a feature of equal societies.³⁵ Meritocracy and access to education are prerequisites for intergenerational mobility. Gary Becker and Richard Posner (2012) therefore recommend that governments provide first-class education and social services to gifted, yet underprivileged children.³⁶ Social welfare spending helps reduce education gaps for students from disadvantaged backgrounds by up to 42.9 percentage points (Ashenfelter & Krueger, 1994; OECD, 2010).

But OECD economists find government-funded higher education and merit-based scholarships do not entirely reduce unfair favoritism of privilege (OECD, 2010). Instead, intergenerational immobility persists. Parental backgrounds influence student

³⁴<http://www.conferenceboard.ca/hcp/details/society/intergenerational-income-mobility.aspx>

³⁵<http://www.conferenceboard.ca/hcp/details/society/intergenerational-income-mobility.aspx>

³⁶<http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/2012/12/meritocracy-social-mobility-intergenerational-mobilityposner.html>

achievement in secondary education by up to 63 gradient points in the PISA Score³⁷. Children of uneducated parents are three times less likely to start tertiary education, facing an overall intergenerational persistence of 66.7 percentage points. Surprisingly, intergenerational immobility remains around 20-30 percentage points, even in countries with anonymous student bodies. Children from parents with academic backgrounds also benefit from a wage premium of up to 20%, compared to those growing up in non-academic households (Atkinson, Maynard & Trinder, 1983; Corak & Heisz, 1999). The link between individual and parental earnings ranges from 15 to 50% intergenerational earnings elasticity across OECD countries (Charles & Hurst, 2002; Mazumder, 2005). Harvard Professor Robert Putnam (2015) therefore argues that people might not overcome their parent's social economic status because societal class creates and molds one's expectations for success and ability (Mulligan, 1997). Living in a society with little merit-based opportunity reinforces low expectations for escape. Education may not make sense if there is no hope for merit-based mobility (Osborne, 2001). Intergenerational advancement may thus only prosper in the wake of meritocracy, an overlooked prerequisite of societal equality.

While economists can improve access to economic market opportunities,³⁸ institutional policy makers can minimize discrimination and global governance entities instigate intergenerational transfers, social scientists should focus on how to build societal trust in merit-based intergenerational mobility (Brasington, Kato & Semmler, 2010; Ghilarducci, 2005; Puauschunder, 2017a). Meritocracy as the psychological backbone of a fair society; together with hopeful trust in intertemporal improvement are key drivers of economic productivity, opening an innovative path to a long-term equitable society.

3. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND FUTURE OUTLOOK

Intergenerational responsibility is as old as mankind. Climate change, overindebtedness of nation states and an aging Western world population, however, have leveraged the demand for intergenerational equity to unprecedented momentum.

This paper was targeted at promoting the idea of intergenerational equity and intertemporal harmoniously balanced transfers in the corporate world as an alternative to national governance and novel extension of contemporary Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) models. Intergenerationally responsible leadership is built on the idea that corporate executives have an obligation to incorporate needs of far-ranging constituents, including future generations.

This paper was designed to help readers understand intergenerational equity leadership from different angles. It is aimed at helping people who are motivated to learn about contemporary

intergenerational equity constraints in the domains of finance, economics and ecologic sustainability. A broad readership comprising of leaders from academia, the legislative branch and public policy making, who consider implementing intergenerational balance, should be informed. Intergenerational equity implementation recommendations are given to serve academics, public executives and private sector representatives. Investigating intergenerational equity is a formidable task as for touching on unprecedented predicaments comprising manifold stakeholders. An engagement of various stakeholders on the differing intergenerational predicaments results in a disparity of intergenerational equity notions. As a first step towards resolving societal losses imbued in the complexity of this novel phenomenon but also to innovatively explore new opportunities to ingrain intergenerational responsibility within globalizing economies; future research may study intergenerational equity with special attention to expert opinions and stakeholder facets in the interplay of public and private sector approaches. Holistically describing intergenerational equity with attention to stakeholders' perspectives will help overcoming socio-economic losses implied by various societal notions. Averting multi-stakeholder conflicts in the implementation of intergenerational equity will aid harmonizing intergenerational equity on a grand scale.

When investigating the natural human intergenerational conscientiousness, behavioral economics insights on human decision-making may innovatively be considered. Behavioral economics depict human rationality bounded by mental limitations and heuristic decision short cuts in an overly complex governmental architecture over which political leaders have limited control (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). These errors are crucial in ethical considerations with irreversible impact on society. The emerging field of bounded ethicality describes predictable psychological processes that let people engage in ethically questionable behavior inconsistent with their preferred ethics. Bounded ethicality occurs when ethical individuals are unaware of indirect unethical consequences that erode over time (Admati, 2017). While bounded ethicality research offers a way to realistically capture intergenerational conscientiousness, we miss a whole-rounded intergenerational equity decision-making frame to test the applicability of the bounded ethicality paradigm onto intergenerational concerns and explore motives for sacrificing to future generations within the social compound and financial markets (Lazonick, 2017).

Intergenerational conscientiousness requires social responsibility and intertemporal foresight to discount future lives. In the search to alleviate human bounded ethicality on intertemporal dilemmas, emotions were recently found to influence time perspectives and social responsibility (Horberg, Oveis & Keltner, 2011). Emotionally laden intergenerational values appear as windows of opportunity to steer intergenerational ethicality in human decision-making. Trust - as a concept related to emotionality - could be an additional intergenerational ethicality nudges to overcome the lack of identification with future beneficiaries (Ostrom, 2009).

³⁷ The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is a worldwide study by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) of 15-year-old school pupils' scholastic performance on mathematics, science, and reading.

³⁸ <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/05/upshot/why-the-new-research-on-mobility-matters-an-economists-view.html?abt=0002&abg=0>

Based on a theoretical introduction of intergenerational equity as a natural behavioral law (Puaschunder, 2017b), preparatory expert knowledge empirically fortify the idea of intergenerational conscientiousness as a humane-imbued cue. Retrieving a framework of intergenerational equity challenges regarding an aging population, over-indebtedness and ecological constraints with attention to stakeholder-specific public and private sector approaches and depicting potential human intergenerational conscientiousness bounds and triggers will allow deriving recommendations for well-balanced intergenerational equity public and private sector implementation solutions.

Based on exploratory expert information on intergenerational equity, the social representations on intergenerational equity reveal stakeholder-specificities of intergenerational responsibility in order to compare intergenerational equity practices and trends throughout the global arena. Addressing stakeholder-specificities of intergenerational responsibility will holistically depict intergenerational equity in the post-2008/09 World Financial Crisis era. A more sophisticated investigation of stakeholder-nuanced intergenerational responsibility will pay attention to public and private sector intergenerational contributions (Puaschunder, 2017b).

Intergenerational equity implementation solutions should help individuals and politicians to make decisions with respect for future generations and establish socially responsible leadership. New ways how to change lifestyles that lead to sustainable and intergenerationally conscientious living should be suggested featuring insights on societal decision-making and collective choices. Intergenerational conscientiousness nudges should be retrieved in field and laboratory experiments. The relation of emotions, trust and social forces regarding common goods allocation preferences should be captured in order to enhance intergenerational, social conscientiousness.

Individual decision-making on intergenerational equity should be coupled with studies on multivariate and network analyses of public and private intergenerational equity considerations throughout the global arena.

Featuring differing constituencies, international consensus finding on intergenerational equity is hindered as parts of the world are more affected than others. While intergenerational equity is a global problem, there are vast national differences in its manifestation and implementation. In opening, booming economies - foremost China, India and other Asian novel power nations - the upcoming generation has enormous advantages compared to the past. In free market economies, an upcoming population with no siblings to share enjoys unprecedented access to wealth and opportunities. The Asian youth have been on the receiving end of enormous wealth accumulated in a very short time. The solutions to current Western world intergenerational problems are connected to the rise of these nations and Western pension funds may be pegged to emerging markets. Problematic appears that growing economies with increasing population will have a higher resource consumption and energy demand putting sustainable consumption endeavors at stake. Ethical questions arise if these emerging cultures have the same right as the Western world

had centuries ago - in the age of industrialization - to consume and prosper in the eye of climate change.

International comparisons of intergenerational social welfare schemes will derive public and private sector recommendations on intergenerational equity contributions in the interplay of favorable market incentive structures and prescriptive public policies. Investigating intergenerational equity before and after the 2008/09 World Financial Crisis will fortify our understanding of intergenerational equity as a risk management and crisis prevention strategy. The unprecedented impact of an aging Western world population on social welfare service provision with special attention to Eurozone frictions arising from the combination of bailouts and an aging, shrinking Euro-population should be captured.

Theoretically describing and empirically testing human intergenerational ethicality introduces intergenerational equity as a natural behavioral law. In a history of turning to natural law for solving societal predicaments on a global scale in times of crises; understanding intergenerational equity as a natural behavioral law alleviates potential aggression potential between generations and promotes sustainable humankind. Outlining intergenerational equity as a natural behavioral law backs the legal case for sustainability, stimulates the academic discourse and allows aligning diverse stakeholder notions on intergenerational concerns. Acknowledging intergenerational equity as a natural behavioral law establishes the legal basis for global justice in order to leverage eternal equity into universal and impartial human rights over time. Applying bounded ethicality onto financial and environmental considerations spearheads behavioral law and economics models in an interdisciplinary way and fosters an accurate understanding of the limitations of human social responsibility on intergenerational conscientiousness. Both approaches, capturing intergenerational equity theoretically and empirically, help averting intergenerational tensions and work towards intergenerational balance in-between generations.

Drawing a picture of the shared common sense on intergenerational equity, but also revealing stakeholder-specific nuances helps diminish communication barriers and aligns less coherent viewpoints on intergenerational fairness. Contributing to new socio-economic thinking on intergenerational equity helps understanding the social representations of intergenerational equity as an opportunity to forecast individual behavior as well as predict future intergenerational trends. Highlighting stakeholder-specific expert knowledge allows deriving recommendations to lead academics, technocrats and practitioners to reflect deeper on intergenerational conscientiousness. Stakeholder-specific facets of intergenerational responsibility advance our knowledge on the well-tempered interplay of responsible market actors and governmental oversight control as vital ingredients of *Generationspartnerships*. Gaining first-hand insights from public and private actors on intergenerational equity allows predictions on how to build public-private-partnerships in order to alleviate intergenerational frictions. Knowledge of stakeholder-specific success factors also reduces socio-economic losses imbued in the complexity of the novel phenomenon and aids a harmonious implementation of intergenerational responsibility.

Empirically finding human-imbued, future-oriented intergenerational ethicality provides evidence for the legal codification of intergenerational fairness on an international basis. Expert knowledge coupled with behavioral economic insights on how to improve human cognition regarding future-orientation and social responsibility aids the administration of intergenerational equity. Deriving information on circumstances under which decision makers are likely to be intergenerationally conscientious is targeted at outlining ways how to additionally improve intergenerational equity in the absence of legal enforcement and governmental control. Finding responsibility triggers helps designing contexts that advance intergenerational equity to complement institutional policies. Unraveling intergenerational equity downfall risks enables institutional technocrats to better design contexts that automatically raise future orientation and open ways to steer civic duty compliance based on a cooperative government-citizen relationship regarding intergenerational concerns.

Investigating intergenerational constraints from a global governance perspective helps understanding the impact of public and private sector contributions on intergenerational fairness. Studying public welfare problems as well as financial market predicaments and environmental constraints concurrently elucidates similarities and differences of public and private sector approaches to ensure intergenerational equity. Mapping intergenerational

equity throughout the world allows international comparisons of public and private sector intergenerational responsibility approaches in order to derive multi-faceted success factors for a concerted implementation of intergenerational responsibility. Paying attention to the 2008/09 World Financial Crisis provides a unique snapshot of socio-economic changes implied by a financial turmoil and helps portraying crises as opportunity for ingraining ethicality throughout society. In sum understanding the socio-dynamics of intergenerational equity will serve as a prerequisite for an intergenerationally harmonious and a future sustainable humanity.

Overall research on intergenerational equity pursues the greater goal of freeing from short-termism shackles and grant wings of wisdom for our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Faith in future liberty grounded on noble munificence over time will acknowledge constancy of our children's freedom, economic prosperity and access to global common goods in an intertemporally favorable environment and Pareto efficient overlapping generations society. Socially responsible intelligentsia about the future of tomorrow's citizens of the world will pave the road to intertemporally harmonious justice; while foresighted vigilance seeds the victory of eternal equity sparked in our fin-de-millénaire.

REFERENCES

- Admati, A.R. (2017). A skeptical view of financialized corporate governance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(3), 131-150. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.3.131>
- Allais, M. (1947). *Economie et intérêt*. Imprimerie Nationale, Paris.
- Arrow, K., Bowles, S., & Durlauf, St. (1999). *Meritocracy and economic inequality*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Ashenfelter, O., & Krueger, A. (1994). Estimates of the economic return to schooling from a new sample of twins. *American Economic Review*, 84(5), 1157-1172.
- Atkinson, A.B., Maynard, A.K., & Trinder, C.G. (1983). *Parents and children: Incomes in two generations*. London: Heinemann.
- Becker, G.S. (1988). Family economics and the inheritance of inequality. *American Economic Review*, 78(1), 1-13.
- Becker, G.S., & Tomes, N. (1986). Human capital and the rise and fall of families. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 4(4), 1-39. <https://doi.org/10.1086/298118>
- Borjas, G. (1995). Ethnicity, neighborhoods, and human capital externalities. *American Economic Review*, 85(3), 365-390.
- Bosco-Ellen, D. (2015). Lecture notes. GECO 5250: *Rethinking Capitalism*. Spring 2015. New York: The New School.
- Bouchard, T.J., & McGue, M. (1981). Familial studies of intelligence: A review. *Science*, 212(4498), 1055-1059. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7195071>
- Bowles, S., Gintis, H., & Osborne, M. (2008). *Unequal chances: Family background and economic success*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brasington, D., Kato, M., & Semmler, W. (2010). Transitioning out of poverty. *Metroeconomica: International Review of Economics*, 61(1), 68-95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-999X.2009.04062.x>
- Centeno, M.A., & Tham, A. (2013). *The emergence of risk in the global system*. Unpublished working paper. Princeton University.
- Charles, K.K., & Hurst, E. (2002). *The correlation of wealth across generations*. Chicago: University of Chicago working paper. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w9314>
- Chetty, R., Hendren, N., & Katz, L.F. (2015). *The effects of exposure to better neighborhoods on children: New evidence from the moving to opportunity experiment*. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research working paper. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w21156>
- Cooper, S., Durlauf, St., & Johnson, P. (1994). On the evolution of economic status across generations. *American Economic Review*, 84(2), 50-58.
- Corak, M., & Heisz, A. (1999). The intergenerational earnings and income mobility of Canadian men: Evidence from the longitudinal income tax data. *Journal of Human Resources*, 34(3), 505-533. <https://doi.org/10.2307/146378>
- Diamond, P. (1965). National debt in a neoclassical growth model. *American Economic Review*, 55(5), 1126-1150.
- Durlauf, St. (2001). A framework for the study of individual behavior and social interaction. *Sociological Methodology*, 31(1), 47-87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0081-1750.00089>
- Erikson, R., & Goldthorpe, J.H. (1992). *The constant flux: A study of class mobility in the industrial societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eurostat (2015). Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics
- Foley, D.K. (2015). *David Gordon Lecture: Rethinking Financial Capitalism and the*

- "Information" Economy. Delivered at the ASSA-URPE meetings in San Diego, CA, January 4, 2013.
23. Fraser, N. (2014). Can society be commodities all the way down? Post-Polanyian reflections on capitalist crisis. *Economy and Society*, 43(4), 441-458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2014.898822>
 24. Ghilarducci, T. (2005). Female dual labor markets and employee benefits. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 52(1), 18-37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0036-9292.2005.00332.x>
 25. Ghilarducci, T., & McGahey, R. (2013). Editor's introduction *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 80(3), 21-22.
 26. Goldberger, A. (1989). Economic and mechanical models of intergenerational transmission. *American Economic Review*, 79(3), 504-513.
 27. Horberg, E.J., Oveis, C., & Keltner, D. (2011). Emotions as moral amplifiers: An appraisal tendency approach to the influences of distinct emotions upon moral judgments. *Emotion Review*, 3, 237-244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073911402384>
 28. Klein, N. (2014). *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
 29. Lazonick, W. (2017). *The functions of the stock market and the fallacies of shareholder value*. Institute for New Economic Thinking Working Paper No. 58. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2993978>
 30. Loehlin, J., & Nichols, R. (1976). *Heredity, environment and personality*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
 31. Luf, G. (2011). *Grundfragen der Rechtsphilosophie und Rechtsethik: Einführung in die Rechtswissenschaften und ihre Methoden*. Vienna: Manz.
 32. Magdoff, F., & Foster, J.B. (2010). *What every environmentalist needs to know about capitalism: A citizen's guide to capitalism and the environment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
 33. Mazumder, B. (2005). The apple falls even closer to the tree than we thought: New and revised estimates of the intergenerational inheritance of earnings. In S. Bowles, H. Gintis & M. Osborne, (eds.), *Unequal Chances: Family Background and Economic Success, 80-99*. New York: Russell Sage.
 34. Menchik, P. (1979). Intergenerational transmission of inequality: An empirical study of wealth mobility. *Economica*, 46(184), 349-362. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2553676>
 35. Mulligan, C. (1997). *Parental priorities and economic inequality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 36. Nafeez, A. (2013). Pentagon bracing for public dissent over climate and energy shocks: NSA prism is motivated in part by fears that environmentally-linked disasters could spur anti-government activism. *The Guardian*, June 14.
 37. OECD (2010). *Economic policy reform 2010: Going for growth*. Paris: OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/growth-2010-en>
 38. Osborne, M.A. (2002). The determinants of individual earnings: Skills, preferences, and schooling. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 39(4), 1137-1176.
 39. Ostrom, E. (2009). *The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel Laureate 2009*, speech.
 40. Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the 21st century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 41. Puauschunder, J.M. (2015). On the social representations of intergenerational equity. *Oxford Journal of Finance and Risk Perspectives*, 4(4), 78-99.
 42. Puauschunder, J.M. (2016a). Intergenerational climate change burden sharing: An economics of climate stability research agenda proposal. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Economics and Commerce*, 16(3), 31-38.
 43. Puauschunder, J. M. (2016b). Putty capital and clay labor: Differing European Union capital and labor freedom speeds in times of European migration. *The New School Economic Review: A Journal of Critical Economics at the New School*, 8(3), 147-168.
 44. Puauschunder, J.M. (2016c). The call for global responsible intergenerational leadership in the corporate world: The quest for an integration of intergenerational equity in contemporary Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) models. In Jamali, D. (ed.), *Comparative Perspectives in Global Corporate Social Responsibility*, 275-288. Hershey: IGI Global Advances in Business Strategy and Competitive Advantage Book Series.
 45. Puauschunder, J.M. (2017b). *Global responsible intergenerational leadership: A conceptual framework and implementation guidance for intergenerational fairness*. Wilmington: Vernon Art & Science Series in Economics.
 46. Putnam, R.D. (2015). *Our kids: The American dream in crisis*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
 47. Samuelson, P.A. (1958). An exact consumption-loan model of interest with or without the social contrivance of money. *Journal of Political Economy*, 12, 467-482. <https://doi.org/10.1086/258100>
 48. Sandbrook, R., Edelman, M., Heller, P., & Teichman, J. (2007). *Social democracy in the global periphery: Origins, challenges, prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511491139>
 49. Shaikh, A. (2013). Crisis, austerity, and the role of economic theory in policy. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 80(3), 653-664.
 50. Solon, G.R. (1992). Intergenerational income mobility in the United States. *American Economic Review*, 82(3), 393-408.
 51. Solon, G.R. (1999). Intergenerational mobility in the labor market. In O. Ashenfelter & D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics*, 1761-1800. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4463\(99\)03010-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4463(99)03010-2)
 52. Streeck, W. (2011). *The crisis in context: Democratic capitalism and its contradictions*. MPIfG Working Paper. Cologne: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies. Cologne.
 53. Taubman, P. (1976). The determinants of earnings: Genetic, family, and other environments: A study of white male twins. *American Economic Review*, 66(5), 858-870.
 54. Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185, 1124-1131. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124>
 55. Volscho, Th.W., & Kelly, N.J. (2012). The rise of the super-rich: Power resources, taxes, financial markets, and the dynamics of the top 1 percent, 1949 to 2008. *American Sociological Review*, 77(5), 679-699. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412458508>
 56. Zaretsky, E. (2015). Lecture notes. GECCO 5250: *Rethinking Capitalism*. Spring 2015. New York: The New School.