

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

A Historical Note on the Original Meaning of Metaeconomics

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/59137> since

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



ISSN 1822-8011 (print)
ISSN 1822-8038 (online)

MYKOLO ROMERIO UNIVERSITETAS
MYKOLAS ROMERIS UNIVERSITY

LIETUVOS MOKSLŲ AKDEMIJA
LITHUANIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

INTELEKTINĖ EKONOMIKA

Mokslo darbų žurnalas

2009, Nr. 1(5)

INTELLECTUAL ECONOMICS

Scientific Research Journal

No 1(5), 2009

Vilnius
2009

TARPTAUTINĖ REDAKCIJOS KOLEGIJA

Vyriausiasis redaktorius

Prof. habil. dr. Antanas Buračas, Mykolo Romerio universitetas ir Lietuvos mokslų akademija, Lietuva

Vyriausiojo redaktoriaus pavaduotoja

Prof. dr. Dalė Dzemydienė, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Atsakingasis redaktorius

Prof. dr. Gediminas Davulis, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Nariai:

Prof. dr. Kim Viborg Andersen, Kopenhagos verslo mokyklos Informatikos institutas, Danija

Prof. habil. dr. Suhrit K. Dey, Rytų Ilinojaus universitetas, JAV

Doc. dr. Algis Dobravolskas, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Prof. dr. Jan Głuchowski, Torunės aukštoji bankų mokykla, Lenkija

Prof. dr. Bernard Haudeville, Polio Sezamo universitetas, Prancūzija

Prof. dr. Andrzej Herman, Varšuvos ekonomikos mokykla, Lenkija

Dr. Jens Hölscher, Braitono universitetas, Jungtinė Karalystė

Prof. dr. Alfonsas Laurinavičius, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Prof. dr. Walter Leal Filho, Hamburgo technikos universitetas, Vokietija

Prof. dr. Irena Mačerinskienė, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Doc. dr. Algirdas Miškinis, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Prof. dr. Rimantas Alfonsas Petrauskas, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Prof. dr. Alvydas Pumputis, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Prof. habil. dr. Ona Gražina Rakauskienė, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Prof. dr. Natalija M. Rimaševska, Rusijos mokslų akademijos Gyventojų socialinių-ekonominių problemų institutas, Rusija

Prof. dr. Vitalija Rudzkienė, Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva

Prof. habil. dr. Aleksandras Vytautas Rutkauskas, Mykolo Romerio universitetas ir Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universitetas, Lietuva

Prof. dr. Ardak Sakhanova, Kazachstano nacionalinis pedagoginis universitetas, Kazachstanas

Doc. dr. Margarita Starkevičiūtė, Europos Parlamentas

Prof. dr. Georg Winckler, Vienos universitetas, Austrija

Prof. dr. Wita Wojtkowski, Boise valstijos universitetas, JAV

Prof. habil. dr. Edmundas Kazimieras Zavadskas, Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universitetas, Lietuva

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Dr. Hab. Antanas Buračas, Mykolas Romeris University and Lithuanian Academy of Sciences

Deputy Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Dr. Dalė Dzemydienė, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Managing Editor

Prof. Dr. Gediminas Davulis, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Members:

Prof. Ph. D. Kim Viborg Andersen, Institute of Informatics, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Prof. Ph. D. Suhrit K. Dey, East Illinois University, USA Assoc. Prof. Dr. Algis Dobravolskas, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Ph. D. Jan Głuchowski, High School of Banking in Torun, Poland

Prof. Ph. D. Bernard Haudeville, Paul Sezame University, France

Prof. Ph. D. Andrzej Herman, High School of Economics in Warsaw, Poland

Dr. Jens Hölscher, Brighton Business School, Brighton University, United Kingdom

Prof. Dr. Alfonsas Laurinavičius, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr. Walter Leal Filho, Technical University, Hamburg, Germany

Prof. Dr. Irena Mačerinskienė, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Algirdas Miškinis, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr. Rimantas Alfonsas Petrauskas, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr. Alvydas Pumputis, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr. Hab. Ona Gražina Rakauskienė, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr. Natalija M. Rimashevskaya, Institute of Socio-economic Problems of Demography, Russian Academy of Science, Russia

Prof. Dr. Vitalija Rudzkienė, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr. Hab. Aleksandras Vytautas Rutkauskas, Mykolas Romeris University and Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr. Ardak Sakhanova, National Pedagogical University, Kazakhstan

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Margarita Starkevičiūtė, European Parliament

Prof. Ph. D. Georg Winckler, University of Vienna, Austria

Prof. Ph. D. Wita Wojtkowski, Boise State University, USA

Prof. Dr. Hab. Edmundas Kazimieras Zavadskas, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Lithuania

Pusmetiniame žurnale „Intelektinė ekonomika“ spausdinami straipsniai pirmiausia šiomis temomis:

- intelektinė ekonomika;
- žinių ekonomikos metodologiniai pagrindai;
- informacinių technologijų ekonomikoje intelektiniai ištekliai;
- elektroninės komercijos ir verslo valdymo konceptualūs sprendimai.

KORESPONDENCIJA

Kviečiame straipsnius ir kitą korespondenciją siųsti žurnalo „Intelektinė ekonomika“ atsakingajam redaktoriui prof. habil. dr. Gediminui Davuliui adresu:

Mykolo Romerio universitetas
Ekonomikos ir finansų valdymo fakultetas
Ateities g. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lietuva
Tel. +370 5 271 4547
Fax. +370 5 271 4652

Elektroninė straipsnio kopija; ją, parengtą pagal reikalavimus, siųsti elektroninio pašto adresu: **int.economics@mruni.lt** arba **antanas.buracas@gmail.com**

INTELEKTINĖ EKONOMIKA, 2008, II tomas, Nr. 2(4).

Mykolo Romerio universiteto ir Lietuvos mokslų akademijos tarptautinis mokslo žurnalas. Straipsniai spausdinami lietuvių ir anglų kalbomis.

Žurnalas „Intelektinė ekonomika“ pradėtas rengti 2007 m., leidžiamas balandžio ir spalio mėn.

Adresas internete:

<http://www3.mruni.lt/~int.economics/>

The bi-annual journal *Intellectual Economics* is oriented for publishing articles, first of all, from the following fields of research:

- Intellectual economics;
- Methodological backgrounds of knowledge economics;
- Intellectual resources of information technologies for economics;
- Conceptual solutions of electronic commerce and business management.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Authors are invited to send their papers for submission to Prof. Dr. Gediminas Davulis, managing editor of journal “Intellectual Economics”, addressed to:

Mykolas Romeris University
Faculty of Economics and Finance Management
Ateities str. 20, LT-80303, Vilnius, Lithuania
Phone: +370 5 271 45 47
Fax.: +370 5 271 46 52

Electronic version of papers according to design requirements for manuscripts is necessary; please send by e-mail to: **int.economics@mruni.lt** or **antanas.buracas@gmail.com**

INTELLECTUAL ECONOMICS, 2008, Vol. II, No 2(4).

International research journal of Mykolas Romeris University and Lithuanian Academy of sciences. Papers are publishing in Lithuanian, English languages.

The bi-annual journal “Intellectual Economics” was initiated in 2007, now with April and October issues per year.

Online web address:

http://www3.mruni.lt/~int.economics/index_en.html

TURINYS

	<i>Redaktorių kolegijos žodis</i>	6
Giandomenica Becchio.	Istorinės pastabos dėl originalios metaekonomikos prasmės	7
Krystyna Bobińska.	Iššūkiai demokratijai pokomunistinėse ES šalyse (išpirkus valstybės kontroliuojamų nedemokratišų šalių įmones)	12
Gediminas Davulis.	Lietuvos situacijos vietinių mokesčių politikos analizė	21
Ignas Dzemyda, Borisas Melnikas.	Inovacijos, moksliniai tyrimai ir eksperimentinė plėtra Europos Sąjungoje: įtaka regionų ekonomikai.....	30
Margarita Išoraitė.	Strateginių aljansų reikšmė organizacijos veiklai	39
Algimantas Juozapavičius, Kazimieras Mickus, Gediminas Mikaliūnas, Evaldas Urbonas.	Reikalavimų automatizuotų organizacinių procesų valdymui analizė.....	47
Steven Keuning, Luis Serna.	Europos statistikos sudarymas ir panaudojimas Europos centrinių bankų sistemoje.....	57
Algimantas Misiūnas, Ieva Balsytė.	Tvarios socialinės raidos esmė ir vertinimo galimybės.....	61
	<i>Institucinė apžvalga</i>	72
Anastasios Karavavoglou.	Kviečia publikuoti naujas tarptautinis ekonomikos mokslų ir tarptautinių tyrimų žurnalas.....	72
	<i>Naujų leidinių recenzijos</i>	73
Dalė Dzemydienė.	Laisvųjų informacinių sprendimų įtaka informacinių technologijų plėtrai (recenzija Žilvino Jančoro ir Mykolo Okulič-Kazarino knygai „Laisvieji informaciniai sprendimai“)	73
	<i>Tarptautinių konferencijų atgarsiai</i>	77
	Naujas Europos Finansinių paslaugų veidas /	
	Apie 22 metinę Europos finansų konvenciją, Lisabona, Portugalija 2009 05 19–2009 05 20	77
Vitalija Rudzkiene	Pirmasis viršūnių susitikimas tvarios plėtros ir biologinės įvairovės klausimais „Gloss 2008“ (Raipur, India).....	78
Vladas Rimkus.	Mokesčių administravimo ir maitų plėtra (Ryga, Latvija)	79
Atmena žurnalo „Intelektinė ekonomika“ autoriams.....		81
Informacija prenumeratoriams		84

CONTENTS

	<i>Preface of the Editorial Board</i>	6
Giandomenica Becchio.	A Historical Note on the Original Meaning of Metaeconomics	7
Krystyna Bobińska.	Challenges for Democracy in Post Communist EU countries as a Consequence of Privatization of State Enterprises	12
Gediminas Davulis.	Analysis of a Situation on Local Taxes in Lithuania	21
Ignas Dzemyda, Borisas Melnikas.	Inovations, Research and Development in European Union: Impact on Regional Economy	30
Margarita Išoraitė.	Importance of Strategic Alliances in Company's Activity.....	39
Algimantas Juozapavičius, Kazimieras Mickus, Gediminas Mikaliūnas, Evaldas Urbonas.	The Analysis of Requirements to Automatized Management of Organizational Processes	47
Steven Keuning, Luis Serna.	Production and Usage of European Statistics by the European System of Central Banks	57
Algimantas Misiūnas, Ieva Balsytė.	The Essence of Sustainable Social Development and Possibilities for Measuring IT	61
	<i>Institutional Review</i>	72
Anastasios Karasavoglou.	Call for papers the International Journal of Economic Sciences and Applied Research	72
	<i>Book Review</i>	73
Dalė Dzemydienė.	The Impact of Free Information Decisions on the Development of Information Technologies (Review on Žilvinas Jančoras' and Mykolas Okulič-Kazarinas' manual "Free Information Decisions")	73
	<i>From International Conferences</i>	77
	The New Face of European Financial Services / The 22nd Annual European Finance Convention. Lisbon, Portugal – 19 05 2009–20 05 2009	77
Vitalija Rudzkienė.	First Global Summit on Sustainable Development and Biodiversity „Gloss 2008“ (Raipur, India)	78
Vladas Rimkus.	Conference on Development of Tax Administration and Customs, Riga, Latvia	79
Submission requirements		82
Subscription Information		84

Stiprėjant *Intelektinės ekonomikos* autorių greitoms, žurnalas toliau bus leidžiamas kartu su Lietuvos mokslų akademija, ypač jos Humanitarinių ir socialinių mokslų skyriaus nariais. Žurnalas taip pat įtraukiamas į EBSCO platinamų mokslinių publikacijų bazę.

Šiame numeryje apžvelgiami intelektinių organizacinių sprendimų institucinėse sistemose ir fiskalinėje srityje tyrimai. Krystyna Bobińska originaliai nušviečia įmonių išpirkimo Rytų Europos šalyse proceso įtaką jų demokratizacijai. Borisas Melnikas ir Ignas Dzemyda nagrinėja, kokios naudos galima tikėtis iš mokslinių regionalizacijos tyrimų. Margarita Išoraitė per strateginių aljansų prizmę apibūdina institucinės konsolidacijos organizacinius efektus. Gediminas Davulis tęsia mokesčių sistemos poveikio regioninės ekonomikos plėtrai tyrimus. Toliau analizuojami organizacinių procesų valdymui keliami reikalavimai (Algimantas Juozapavičius, Kazimieras Mickus, Gediminas Mikaliūnas, Evaldas Urbonas).

Dėmesio nusipelno Europos finansų statistikos institucinės sistemos metodiniai aspektai, pristatomi Europos centrinio banko Bendrosios statistikos direktorato generalinio direktoriaus Steveno Keuningo ir vyr. statistiko Luis Serna. Įdomios yra Giandomenica Becchio pastabos dėl metaekonomikos tyrimų sampratos turinio ir ištakų, metaekonomikos ir ekonominės etikos sąsajų didėjant šios tyrimų srities svarbai globalizacijos sąlygomis.

Pristatomas neseniai Graikijoje pradėtas leisti panašios kaip *Intelektinė ekonomika* tematinės *Tarptautinis ekonomikos mokslų ir taikomųjų tyrimų žurnalas*. Tęsiamas įdomesnių tarptautinių konferencijų apžvalga. Ji, be abejo, būtų įvairesnė, jei mūsų redakcinės kolegijos nariai ir skaitytojai daugiau dalytųsi savo patirtimi.

Antanas Buračas

Starting with this issue, the *Intellectual Economics* is co-edited with the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, especially the members of its Division of Humanitarian and Social Sciences. The journal also is included in the EBSCO dissemination net of scientific editions.

This issue is devoted to the discussion of intellectual managerial and fiscal decisions in the East European institutional systems. In particular, Krystyna Bobińska originally reveals the influence of buy-outs by state controlled enterprises to democratization of former centralized economies. Borisas Melnikas and Ignas Dzemyda analyse the utility of regionalization of scientific researches. Margarita Išoraitė determines the organizational effects of the institutional consolidation through the strategic alliances. Gediminas Dievulis continues its researches of taxation system influence to the development of regional economy. Algimantas Juozapavičius, Kazimieras Mickus, Gediminas Mikaliūnas and Evaldas Urbonas also continue the analysis of the requirements to information technologies for the management of organizational processes.

Special attention is given to the methodical aspects of the institutional system of European financial statistics which are discussed by Steven Keuning, the Director general of the Directorate General Statistics of the ECB, and Luis Serna, the senior economist-statistician at the ECB. Giandomenica Becchio discusses the historical notes concerning the original meaning of metaeconomics, interrelations between metaeconomics and ethics, what becomes especially important under globalization processes. Anastasios Karasavvoglou presented for us the new European edition of *the International Journal of Economic Sciences and Applied Research*.

We are continuing also publishing reviews of more interesting international conferences, and inviting other members and readers of our journal to be more active in this.

Antanas Buračas



A HISTORICAL NOTE ON THE ORIGINAL MEANING OF METAECONOMICS

Giandomenica BECCHIO

University of Torino, Department of Economics,
via Po 53, 10124 Torino, Italy
E-mail: giandomenica.becchio@unito.it

Abstract. This is a brief note on the original meaning of the term “metaeconomics” that was coined in 1936, in Vienna, by the mathematician Karl Menger. He was involved in the Viennese debate on the relation between mathematics and logics. As he was a strong supporter of Hilbert’s program, he applied it to social sciences (economics and ethics in particular) in order to find their logical structure. From the point of view of the history of economic theory, Hilbertism was the philosophical framework of the following economic mainstream, i.e. the neoclassical approach. In neoclassical economic theory, there is no place for moral considerations and ethics remained strictly separated from economics. Contemporary behavioural economics considers metaeconomics as a tool for re-embedding ethics into economics, this is an example of the so-called “heterogenesis of the aims”.

JEL classification: B31; B41

Keywords: metaeconomics, Menger, Hilbertism, ethics.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: metaekonomika, Mengeris, Hilberto nuostata, etika.

1. Introduction

The actual debate on metaeconomics involves many fields and spreads upon different methodological approaches. The introduction of the term *metaeconomics* is due to the mathematician Karl Menger (1902-1985). In 1936 he wrote an article on the law of diminishing returns on land, under a suggestion of a famous economist of the Austrian School, Ludwig von Mises. Menger clearly stated that metaeconomics is an application of the Hilbertian program on economic theory. Today metaeconomics has many connotations (Buracas 2004). I will focus my attention on that meaning according to which it is regarded as “an economic approach that makes ethics and the moral dimension explicit in economic reasoning” and “in contrast to (neoclassical) microeconomics proposes to reintegrate ethics and economics” (Buracas 2004, 3): this approach is the one of the so-called behavioural economics (Lynne, 2003). The aim of this short note is to show that if today

metaeconomics has reached this kind of intent, then there was a sort of heterogenesis of the aims as it was conceived by Menger, whose aim was to apply a metamathematical model *à la Hilbert* to economic theory in order to free economics and ethics (generally speaking regarded as social sciences) from logical mistakes.


2. Metaeconomics as a tool for embedding ethics into economics

According to Lynne (2006) metaeconomics is to be intended as a way for going beyond economics: i.e. a way to recognize that there are people oriented not in self-interest, but in the other-interest; metaeconomics approach is oriented to integrate individual and social plans. In this sense it is a form of behavioural economics. Metaeconomics is regarded as a tool for resolving conflicts between egoistic and altruistic behaviours: it is able to satisfy simultaneously ego

and empathy; moving back and forth on a path where any point could or maximize individual interests and satisfy empathetic interests, or vice versa.

Lynne describes metaeconomics model as follows:

$I_{\text{self-interest}}$ and I_{empathy} are isocurves that represent respectively individual interests and empathetic ones: A is the point in which an agent maximizes his individual interest and satisfies his empathetic one; B is the point in which an agent maximizes his empathetic interest and satisfies his individual one.



Moving back and forth on his own isocurves, an agent can alternatively maximize both self and social utility: “metaeconomics value arises from the co-evolutionary (through time, and thus dynamic) interaction and feedback between ego and empathy, self-interest and other-interest, as each conditions and influences the other” (Lynne 2006, 639). Summing up, according to Lynne, metaeconomics is a tool able to reintegrate egoistic motivation of behaviour into altruism and vice versa.

The present note is not focused on going inside Lynne’s model in order to verify and/or criticize it; it is a presentation, mainly from an historical point of view, of how Menger applied metatheory to social science during the 1930s, in order to contextualize his introduction of metaeconomics inside the economic theory. Menger’s aim was very far from reintegrating ethics into economics. An intent conceived in such a way would have left Menger outside the mainstream economic theory. On the contrary, Menger can be regarded as one of the pioneers of mainstream economics, because he applied Hilbertian metatheory to economics and ethics in order to show the proper way for describe social dynamics without any logical fallacy. When he coined the term “metaeconomics” he did not think of a sort of reintegration of ethics in economics; he was thinking of modelling economics and ethics as well into a coher-

ent logical pattern, without any connections between them.

3. The very beginning of metaeconomics

Menger’s adherence to Hilbertism is fundamental in the history of economic theory, because it was the methodological paradigm shared inside his Mathematical Colloquium, where scientists such as Abraham Wald and John von Neumann introduced neowalrasianism into the neoclassical theory, firstly through the formalization of the theory of the General Economic Equilibrium by Schlesinger, Wald and von Neumann, and thereafter of the Theory of Expected Utility by von Neumann and Morgenstern (Weintraub, 1983, 2002). In this sense metaeconomics is strictly connected to neoclassical economic theory.

3.1 The exact thinking in economics

As it is well known, logic deals with the validity of the argument of a proposition and with the degree of truth of propositions. An argument is a set of propositions formed by two premises and a following conclusion. Validity and truth are connected: an argument is valid when, if the premises are true, the conclusion cannot be false. Logicians just deal with the validity of an argument without any regard to other proprieties of an argument (such as utility or persuasion). A valid argument can be formed by false propositions; when a valid argument is formed by true premises, then it is correct.

Menger was engaged in the debate around logics and mathematics that spread in Vienna during the interwar period. Firstly interested in intuitionism (he worked with Brouwer during he mid 1920s), he became a strong supporter of Hilbertism during the 1930s. He tried to apply the Hilbertian model of metalogics to ethics (Menger [1934] 1974) and economics (Menger [1936] 1979) and he coined the term “metaeconomics”: “following a suggestion of Hilbert, modern logicians refer to the study of the logical relations between the statements of a theory as the corresponding *meta-theory*. In this terminology, the contents of the present paper can be described as a chapter in *metaeconomics*” (Menger 1979, 280)¹. He wrote the paper in answer to Ludwig von Mises’s claim “that certain propositions of economics can be *proved* [and] as an example he mentioned the law of diminishing returns” (Menger 1979, 279).

¹ In 1936 Menger published “Bemerkungen zu den Ertragsgesetzen”, which was translated in English in 1954 as “Remarks on the Law of Diminishing Returns. A study in Meta-Economics” (Becchio 2008).

According to Menger, economists tried to find the logical relations between laws about returns and other propositions of economic theory (such as the theory of value) from a logical point of view based on deduction, but they ignored the incontrovertible fact that any kind of scientific proof requires logical sequences of (inductive) inferences. Moreover economists use often badly logical quantifiers. This two kind of inaccuracies, from a logical point of view, often led economists toward confusion between the validity of an argument and its truth. Menger criticized also the fact that economists are mainly worried about the empirical confirmation of the laws they formulate, without caring enough of the correctness of their logical argumentation.

As an example, Menger considered the law of diminishing returns to land first formulated by Eugen Böhm-Bawerk: “additional applications of capital and labor on a piece of land increase the total product, but after a certain point this output increases relatively less than further costs. In other words: like increases of cost produce a decreasing increase of the product” (Menger 1979, 281). It should be referred to diminishing product increments for large outlays. When it is referred to average product for large outlays, “it can be shown by elementary algebra that one satisfies the law of diminishing product increments, but not that of diminishing average product” (Menger 1979, 282). Economists considered as equivalent the two propositions of diminishing product increments and of diminishing average product and they call them “the law of diminishing return”; but according to Menger “hence far from being equivalent, neither of the two laws implies the other” as it can be shown “by elementary algebra and by “simple geometric interpretation” as well (Menger 1979, 282).

Moreover, Menger analyzed the fact that “all so-called proofs of the laws of return ... use the assumption that the input factors of production are economic goods. However, *the economic character of the inputs bears no relation to the question of whether the product increments are non increasing*. Without superadditivity and subhomogeneity of the production function, the law of non increasing product increments need not hold even if the inputs are economic goods. On the other hand, if the product function is superadditive and subhomogeneous, the law does not hold even for non economic inputs” (Menger 1979, 299).

Menger’s conclusions are focused on the fact that it is necessary not to mix the logical interrelations (deductive and inductive) among the statements of a scientific law and the empirical validity of the law itself: “how the various propositions are related,

which ones are consequences of others – these and similar questions are purely logical and have nothing to do with experience” (Menger 1979, 300).

3.2 The exact thinking in ethics

Menger tried to apply Hilbertian metatheory to ethics as well (Menger 1974; 1983). He proposed a general criterion for explaining how to form cohesive social groups, i.e. peaceful groups able to share the same norms. It is a formal ethics (i.e. there are no values hierarchically ranked), logically explained and very far from any normative approach. Menger tried to show how cohesive groups are formed and are able to share the same rules in order to find logical relations among precepts and to reach “an exact thinking in the field of ethics” (Menger 1974, 95), i.e. to apply “*logico-mathematical* thinking to ethical material” (Menger 1974, 97).

According to Menger the adoption of a moral code is an individual decision, but an exact thinking in ethics could be applied to “the treatment of social problems” (Menger 1974, 97), i.e. to the dynamics of social groups. Menger presented a model made by two *disjoint* groups (G_1 and G_2). Any member has four possibilities to associate himself with others: he can associate just with members of his own group (G_1^1 and G_2^2), or just with members of the other group (G_1^2 and G_2^1), or with everybody ($G_1^{1,2}$ and $G_2^{1,2}$) or with nobody (G_1^0 and G_2^0). These four attitudes applied to G_1 and G_2 lead to eight subgroups. Each member of any subgroup is a singleton.

Relations among the eight subgroups can be described as this matrix shows:

	G_1^0	G_1^1	$G_1^{1,2}$	G_1^2	G_2^2	$G_2^{1,2}$	G_2^1	G_2^0
G_1^0	–	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G_1^1	0	1	1	0	0	α	α	0
$G_1^{1,2}$	0	1	1	α	α	1	1	0
G_1^2	0	0	α	1	α	1	1	0
G_2^2	0	0	α	α	1	1	0	0
$G_2^{1,2}$	0	α	1	1	1	1	α	0
G_2^1	0	α	1	1	α	α	1	0
G_2^0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0

α = members of one of the group are willing to accept members of the other group, but not vice versa.

1 = totally compatible;

0 = totally incompatible;

“ G_1^0 and G_2^0 are “hermit groups”; one member of G_1^2 and one member of G_2^1 are “singular pairs” (compatible); one member of G_2^1 and a subgroup of $G_1^{1,2}$ (and one member of G_1^2 and a subgroup of $G_2^{1,2}$) are defined “centered groups”; $G_2^{1,2}$ and $G_1^{1,2}$ are tolerant; G_1^1 and $G_1^{1,2}$ (and G_2^2 and $G_2^{1,2}$) are “pure groups”” (Menger 1974, 100).

G_1^1 , G_2^2 , $G_1^{1,2}$ and $G_2^{1,2}$ are cohesive. There is a difference between $(G_1^1; G_2^2)$ and $(G_1^{1,2}; G_2^{1,2})$. Members of the $(G_1^1; G_2^2)$ shared the same rules, there is a sort of internal cohesion, but nobody is willing to share norms with member of the opposite groups: they are closed; on the other hand, every member of the $(G_1^{1,2}; G_2^{1,2})$ is willing to associate with any member of the other groups.

Having built a logical-formal pattern for describing how peaceful social groups are formed, we would better come back to the initial definition of G_1 and G_2 : “if [they] consist of the members of two faiths, then the groups G_1^2 and G_2^1 are empty. If the members are of two different nationalities, then there may also exist snobs belonging to G_1^2 or G_2^1 . If G_1 and G_2 are the men and the women at a party, then, with respect to the association of dancing, all four cohesive fundamental groups are empty. The only cohesive groups are singular pairs (dancing couples), hermits (non-dancers), and other singletons (wall flowers of either sex)” (Menger 1974, 101).

Summing up, when Menger spoke of a logic of ethics he was referring to social dynamics of groups able to reach coexistence and cohesiveness; any value judgement was dismissed and any consideration on individual choice was avoided: it was a logical description of the ethics of social groups, confined to facts “to describe and to order them without saying anything about foundation or justifications” (Menger 1974, 2).

Concluding remarks

Since the introduction of the term *metaeconomics* by Menger (1936), its meaning shifted towards different connotations. Generally speaking, it can be regarded as the logical and semantic aspects of the “analysis of the taxonomical contents of economic methods and criteria” and of “the nature of economic concepts” (Buracas 2004, 2).

When Menger introduced this term for the first time he had clearly in mind the application of the Hilbertian program to economics, i.e. its axiomatization into a strictly logical pattern. It was a methodological project that soon led economic theory to

the foundation of the neowalrasianism approach in the general economic equilibrium model and to the formulation of the theory of expected utility (Weintraub 1983; 2002). These results are very far from the interpretation of metaeconomics as a form of reintegration of ethics and economics made by behavioural economics.

References

1. Becchio, G. The Complex Role of Karl Menger in the Viennese Economic Theory. *Review of Austrian Economics*. 2008, 21: 61-79.
2. Buracas, A. On Paradigm of Metaeconomics: Essence and Sense. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*. 2004, 54:1-12.
3. Lynne G.D. Toward a dual motive metaeconomics theory. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*. 2003, 35: 634-651.
4. Lynne G.D. On the Economic of subselves. Toward a Metaeconomics. *Handbook of contemporary behavioural economics. Foundation and Developments* (Morris Alta med.) New York, Sharpe, 2006, p. 99-122.
5. Menger K. An Exact Theory of Social Groups and Relations. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 1938, 5: 790-798.
6. Menger K. *Morality, Decision and social organization toward a logic of ethics*. Dordrecht and Boston: Reidel Publishing Co., 1974.
7. Menger K. *Selected papers in Logic and Foundations, Didactics, Economics*. Dordrecht and Boston: Reidel Publishing Co., 1979.
8. Weintraub, E. R. On the existence of a competitive equilibrium: 1930 – 1954. *Journal of Economic Literature*. 1983, XXI: 1-39.
9. Weintraub, E. R. *How Economics Became a Mathematical Science*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

ISTORINĖS PASTABOS DĖL ORIGINALIOS
METAEKONOMIKOS PRASMĖS

Giandomenica BECCHIO

Turino universiteto ir politechnikos mokyklos dėstytojas

Santrauka. Trumpai apžvelgiama originali *metaekonomikos* termino, 1936 m. įvesto Karlo Mengerio, reikšmė. Jis išitraukė Vienoje į diskusijas dėl matematikos ir logikos sąsajų. Jis domėjosi Hilberto programa, todėl pritaikė metaekonomikos sampratą socialiniams mokslams (konkrečiai, ekonomikai ir etikai) siekdamas išryškinti jų loginę struktūrą. Hilberto nuostatos buvo tuo metu plėtojamos neoklasikinės teorijos filosofinis pagrindas. Šioje ekonomikos teorijoje atsisakyta moralinių bei etinių nuostatų ir jos griežtai atskirtos nuo ekonomikos. Šiuolaikinėje biheavioristinės ekonomikos koncepcijoje metaekonomika vertinama kaip priemonė vėl integruoti etiką į ekonomikos teoriją. Tai akivaizdus vadinamosios tikslų heterogenizės atvejis.

Giandomenica Becchio (Ba Turin, PhD Florence) is assistant professor of economics at the University of Turin and adjunct professor at Polytechnic School of Turin. She has published several papers in national and international journals mainly on history of economic theory. She has been awarded the 2005 Don Lavoie Graduate Students Best Article prize of the Society of the Development of Austrian economics. Her research interests include the history of economic theory and the methodology of economics.

Giandomenica Becchio Turino (Florencija, Italija) universiteto ir politechnikos mokyklos ekonomikos dėstytoja, daktarė. Domisi ekonominės teorijos istorijos klausimais, 2005 m. apdovanota Austrijos ekonomikos plėtros draugijos Don Lavoie premija už geriausią straipsnį.