

*dr Damian S. Pyrkosz*¹

Department of Economic Policy
University of Rzeszów

Man and Relationships in Economy – the Sustainable Development Perspective

INTRODUCTION

Grown-ups love figures... When you tell them you've made a new friend they never ask you any questions about essential matters. They never say to you "What does his voice sound like? What games does he love best? Does he collect butterflies?" Instead they demand "How old is he? How much does he weigh? How much money does his father make?" Only from these figures do they think they have learned anything about him. [...]

'One only understands the things that one tames,' said the fox. 'Men have no more time to understand anything. They buy things all ready made at the shops. But there is no shop anywhere where one can buy friendship, and so men have no friends any more. If you want a friend, tame me.'

'I am looking for friends. What does that mean -- tame?'

'It is an act too often neglected,' said the fox. 'It means to establish ties. [...]' 'To me, you are still nothing more than a little boy who is just like a hundred thousand other little boys. And I have no need of you. And you, on your part, have no need of me. To you I am nothing more than a fox like a hundred thousand other foxes. But if you tame me, then we shall need each other. To me, you will be unique in all the world. To you, I shall be unique in all the world ...

Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, *The Little Prince*

Economics belongs to social science. This is its scientific genealogy. In theory. The practice is however somewhat different. Too often and for too long it has been focused on the use of quantitative analysis, statistical data and econometric modeling to account for economic phenomena and develop a comprehensive picture of society. Mathematisation of economics together with the abundance of seemingly accurate and exhaustive data have removed from the very centre of economic analysis its most crucial part – the human being. Economic

¹ Adres korespondencyjny: Katedra Polityki Gospodarczej, Uniwersytet Rzeszowski, ul. Ćwiklińskiej 2, 35-601 Rzeszów, Polska; tel. (+48 17) 872 1685; e-mail: daspy@univ.rzeszow.pl.

analysis with all its mathematical methodology has become an art for its own sake as it has forgotten the fact that numbers are not some mere abstract measures and indexes but that they ultimately do represent people. Consequently, in common view, economics detached from social science. The recent global financial crisis was quite symptomatic in this respect. Behind the falling rates of employment and growth accompanied by rising rates of consumer and business insolvency and governments spending on the financial sector bailout there were signs of a serious ethical deficiency, as numerous analyses indicated [*inter alia* Weitzner and Darroch, 2009; Árnason, 2010; Curtis, 2008]: wealth was gradually losing its ties to the value of one's work and was more and more often the result of manipulation of data, speculative business activities, creative accounting practices or profit maximization with no social responsibility. In the view of the above abuses, opinions have been voiced that economics needs to reshift its attention to a man – a being entwined in social, economic and environmental relationships with its surrounding world. A notion of sustainable development is an example of the idea that had already been in use for some time and in its essence emphasized not only material but also ethical relationship of a human being to the surrounding environment and other natural species, fellow beings in society and pursuit of economic prosperity driven by self-interest. It is the focus on relationships, specifically, that can make a difference in economics in order to restore economics its human science origin, to reemphasize the value of work and to place the man back in the centre of economic analysis. This change is slowly taking place, though, quite paradoxically, the need for it has already been voiced in the history of economic thought much earlier.

TWO FACES OF ... RELATIONSHIPS

The Founding Father of economics, Adam Smith, regarded relationships as a key to understanding man's role in economy and society. However today he is best known as the author of the groundbreaking "The Wealth of Nations", Smith put a special emphasis on the value of human relationships in one of his earlier works, "The Theory of Moral Sentiments", published in 1759 and meant it to be an integral part of his published nearly twenty years later bestseller. It is also the latter where the author for the first time referred to the idea of *an invisible hand* to describe apparent benefits to society of people behaving in their own interest. Moreover, the idea constitutes the key motive that drives people's relationships.

The two books seem to depict seemingly contradictory roles of human nature and relationships. In his 1776 work Adam Smith notes: *It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest [...] This division of labor [...] is not*

originally the effect of any human wisdom, which foresees and intends that general opulence to which it gives occasion. It is the necessary, though very slow and gradual, consequence of a certain propensity in human nature which has in view no such extensive utility; the propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another [1776, pp. 9,10]. His earlier work however states: *How selfish soever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature, which interest him in the fortune of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it except the pleasure of seeing it* [1759, p. 4]. The two views present two apparently inconsistent attitudes: noncooperative self-interest and other-regarding sympathy respectively. Yet, as Vernon L. Smith [1998, p. 3] observes, they should be rather viewed as expressions of the same general human propensity for social exchange. For this, people develop different relationships with regard to impersonal trade in large-group markets and personal exchange in small-group social transactions.² Human *propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another* denotes more than a mere willingness to exchange goods that is characteristic for market; it also refers to the exchange of gifts and assistance out of sympathy, or in Adam Smith's words: *generosity, humanity, kindness, compassion, mutual friendship and esteem, all the social and benevolent affections...* [Smith, 1759, p. 33].

Pursuit of self-interests, but not selfishness, makes people establish two completely different, yet complementary, kinds of relationships - both critical to the soundly functioning society: personal and other-regarding on the one hand, and impersonal and self-regarding on the other. In both cases the pursuit is driven by the invisible hand of self-interest and, as Vernon L. Smith observed, *exchange backed by self-interest is a positive sum game* [1998, p. 17]. It is, indeed, in both types of relationships and leads to different types of consequences: in markets, impersonal exchange (ultimately market transaction) results in the specialization and creation of both private and public wealth (*wealth of nations*) although *every individual... neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it* [Smith, 1776, p. 293]; in private lives, the exchange - frequently referred to as *beneficence* - also has a utilitarian character. Adam Smith justifies it on the grounds of the fact that man is interested in the fortune and happiness of others just for the pleasure of seeing it: *...though he derives nothing from it except the pleasure of seeing it* [*op.cit.*]. This leads to positive outcomes: strengthening personal, family and social ties - ultimately, human relationships.

The prevalent underlying theme of relationship both in markets and society is utilitarianism. In the case of market impersonal exchange its justification seems quite straightforward: it has to focus on maximization of profit to benefit

² In Adam Smith's view, both work perfectly in concordance with human nature as people, being driven by *an invisible hand*, follow their self interest.

its most efficient actors, thus it cannot follow the other-regarding attitude as it would eventually lead to bankruptcy of economic agents; if implemented on a large scale it would cause chaos and instability in markets and undermine social order, which economy is a part of (the point strongly emphasized by Karl Polanyi). Utilitarianism of the relationship-forming social exchange can also be justified on the grounds of expectation of reciprocal benefits [Smith V.L., *op.cit.*]. Failure to ever return favors to friends and run friendship on the self-regarding impersonal basis will inevitably bring it to an end. Moreover, human relationships are based on (positive) reciprocity: if one shares goods, help, or does favors to another, an obligation is established which compels the beneficiary to return the deed in the future if the relationship is to be maintained. This pattern forms basis for human social behavior, any bilateral and multilateral associations, and friendships. However, apart from positive reciprocity of trading favors, social exchange needs negative reciprocity, too. We can observe it when one fails to reciprocate and acts like a policeman who punishes unkind acts and exerts pressure to demand reciprocity. Without negative reciprocity, reciprocating altruists invite invasion by free riders [*ibid.*, p. 18]

In the view of the above, Adam Smith describes a system based on two kinds of relationships: personal and impersonal. None of them can replace or be replaced by the other: they are both integral and complementary; both must be kept in balance for the sake of society and both contribute to society's well-being, yet in diverse ways. Not only market but also social relationships are critical to provide for stability and prosperity of society. In this way, the two spheres driven by self-interest produce different results: on the one hand, market relationships promote the public interest and make people better producers and consumers, and on the other personal relationships make people more civil and decent towards each other, or simply, better neighbors. [Dougherty, 2002, p. 14]

MARKET IS BUT ONE OPTION

One of the authors who placed a great emphasis on the significance of social relationships for order and stability of society was Karl Polanyi. His seminal work, "The Great Transformation", first published in 1944, provided a penetrating critique of the well established by this time market liberalism, i.e. *the belief that both national societies and the global economy can and should be organized through self-regulating markets* [Block in Polanyi, 1944, p. xviii].

Polanyi regarded economy as an institutional process rooted in society and placed it in the context of social values and relationships. Economy deals with material aspects of human action but together with all the processes it embraces (e.g. maximization of profit) it is to provide for good relationships, eliminate conflicts and establish a system of allocation of wealth that would promote val-

ues of society. It is society which controls economy, not vice versa, and this in turn is affected by social relationships. In Polanyi's view, social relationships play a key motivational role: maintaining social position and the related privileges is more important and provides a more powerful stimulus for economic action (e.g. trade) than a plain economic gain. Hence, economy is an element of society – it is *embedded* in society – and thus subordinated to religion, politics and social relations. A human being is primarily a social construct pursuing cooperation, prestige and enhancement of social capital: relationships are thus the essence of both society and economy and ensure their stability. (...) *man's economy, as a rule, is submerged in his social relationships. He does not act so as to safeguard his individual interest in the possession of material goods; he acts so as to safeguard his social standing, his social claims, his social assets. He values material goods only in so far as they serve this end.* [Polanyi, 1944, p. 48] Maintenance of social ties, accepted code of honor, generosity are paramount. If they are not respected, the individual finds himself as an outcast unable to participate in the reciprocity of the social system.

Karl Polanyi's criticized market-based economy (and classical economists, including Adam Smith) and observed that most human societies were unfamiliar with the motive of gain, the principle of laboring for remuneration, the principle of least effort and a separate distinct institution driven solely by economic motives [ibid., p. 49]. What ensured production and distribution of goods under these circumstances then? Up to the end of feudalism in Western Europe all economic systems were organized on the following three principles, or combination of any of them:

- *reciprocity* which basically denotes reciprocal exchange of goods and services between social entities; this would also entail production of goods to gift to other groups; implemented by means of institution of *symmetry*;
- *redistribution* where trade and production are focused on the central entity (e.g. tribal leader, feudal lord) and then redistributed to members of society; implemented in the institutional pattern of *centricity*;
- *householding* referring to economies where production is focused on individual household production; it is typical of families which produce food, textile and tools for their own consumption; facilitated by *autarchy*;

All the above principles are determined by relationships which, again, become critical for their operation and administration.

These three economic institutions were not mutually exclusive nor they were exclusive of markets for the exchange of goods. Yet the main difference between the three forms of economic organization and market was that the former intrinsically relied on the social aspects of the society they operated in and thus they were explicitly tied to the social relationships. Markets provided only an extra opportunity for the exchange of goods not obtainable otherwise. *In this framework, the orderly production and distribution of goods was secured*

through a great variety of individual motives disciplined by general principles of behavior. Among these motives gain was not prominent. Custom and law, magic and religion cooperated in inducing the individual to comply with rules of behavior which, eventually, ensured his functioning in the economic system [ibid., p. 57].

MARKET SHATTERS RELATIONSHIPS

Until the 19th century the nonmarket systems prevailed though market were both numerous and increased in their importance. In the era of mercantilism, they became the main concern of government but strict regulation and regimentation prevented markets from taking control of human society – as Polanyi observes, *the very idea of a self-regulating market was absent [ibid., p. 58]*. The situation changed with the coming of the Industrial Revolution. Under the circumstances, it reversed the historically normal pattern of subordinating the economy to society, the laissez-faire system of self-regulating markets necessitated subordinating society to the logic of the market. *Ultimately, that is why the control of the economic system by the market is of overwhelming consequence to the whole organization of society: it means no less than the running of society as an adjunct to the market. Instead of economy being embedded in social relations, social relations are embedded in the economic system [ibid., p. 60]*. Excessive reliance on free market and price mechanism undermined social ties, endangered civilizational development, atomized societies and left people virtually defenseless in the face of lack of guidance from governments and cultural institutions. Moreover, as Fred Block implies in the “Introduction” to Polanyi’s 2001 edition, people were not able to use the instruments of democratic governance to control and direct the economy to meet individual and collective needs [*ibid.*, p. xxxviii]. The fact that the system of self-regulating markets destroyed social relationships and subordinated society to the logic of the market produced a series of cataclysms like the two World Wars, the Great Depression, and the rise of fascism.

SUSTAINING RELATIONSHIPS, SUSTAINING DEVELOPMENT

As the world continued to rely on market economy in provision of goods and use it as the main avenue for development, it paid little attention to the increasing environmental and social toil it brought. In effect, relationships suffered both in terms of people’s relations with the surrounding environment (i.e. proliferation of environmental pollution and depletion of natural resources) and human relations within communities and societies (i.e. atomization of society). Under these circumstances the rise of the idea of sustainable development of-

ferred more than the commonly referred to the concept of the three-pronged development pattern. The shift towards harmonious development has come to define human place in the world in terms of its relationship with the material-world creation processes, other human beings and the natural world, and as such revitalizes inherently humanistic values like care, responsibility, a sense of fairness and a sense of being-a-part-of the natural world. As they all denote relationships, they become the underlying theme of sustainable development.

Sustainable development is a concept meant to restore human relationships in terms of care and responsibility: it was lack of these, among others, values in the past that brought degradation of the natural environment, decline of communities and the excess concentration on maximization of profit. With reference to the financial crisis of 2008 it seems that negligence of care and responsibility were its primary underlying cause. "The Economist" magazine denotes it *layered irresponsibility* and defines the crisis in terms of *a genuinely democratic one, with hard-working homeowners and billionaire villains each playing a role* [Enough blame..., 2013]. Another article published by the same magazine [Crash..., 2013] seems to imply the real cause: the market and governments allowed clearly criminal fraudulent conduct of people who created and controlled the system. Bankers and brokers and politicians alike did not care to see negative evidence of the coming crisis as they felt little responsibility to society for their actions. Moreover, their responsibility was dispersed when *trust, the ultimate glue of all financial systems, began to dissolve in 2007... as banks started questioning the viability of their counterparties. They and other sources of wholesale funding began to withhold short-term credit, causing those most reliant on it to founder* [ibid.]. Miller and Jackson [2008] identify as many as nine various groups that collectively bear responsibility for the crisis in the USA: the Federal Reserve, home buyers, Congress, real estate agents, the Clinton administration, mortgage brokers, former Federal Reserve chairman – Alan Greenspan, Wall Street firms and the Bush administration. The list clearly indicates that the crisis was far from being "financial" alone; rather it implies that it is one of responsibility viewed as relationship to other fellow beings in society.

Sense of fairness is one of the most fundamental humanistic values whose implementation is declared by virtually all societies. In everyday life it is rather referred to as justice or equality. Economically, justice (referred to as equity in economics) is fulfilled by means of redistribution, and as such makes one of the alternative economic systems to market distinguished by Karl Polanyi. As one of the principles of sustainable development, justice/equity stems from the conviction central to egalitarian ethics: all people, including the least well-off, are eligible to improve their well-being [Batie, 1989]. Redistribution is thus a primary tool in achieving economic equity and the alleviation of poverty – one of the causes of degradation of the environment. Ruckelshaus [1989] emphasizes that redistribution, on the one hand secures a balanced relationship between the hu-

man-made world and the environment, and on the other it is equally vital for the prosperity of developing and wealthy nations. In the face of the fact that market is driven by inequality, equity-promoting redistribution is then an absolute necessity for socio-economic development and stability, as it has been evidenced by a large body of publications in the last several decades [inter alia Kuznets 1955; Persson and Tabellini, 1991; Berg and Ostry, 2011; Kumhof and Rancière, 2010; Bordo and Meissner, 2012] and its absence breeds abuse and anarchy in society – the ultimate denial and breach of all social relationships. The issue becomes one of the most intriguing problems, particularly in view of the 2008 crisis. A study by Bernstein [2013] finds that there are compelling reasons to believe that inequality can harm growth, yet it is amazingly difficult to prove this is happening.³ Another study by Cynamon and Fazzari [2014] finds evidence that higher inequality and the associated demand drag contributes to the slow recovery.⁴ Moreover, rising inequality destabilizes economies. As for the last economic turndown in the USA, Bertrand and Morse [2013] identify a negative consumption pattern called *trickle-down consumption*. They find that as the rich got richer, that creates an economic arms race in which the middle class spends beyond their means in order to keep up. As a result, Americans save less, bankruptcies become more common, and politicians push for policies to make it easier to take on debt. If, on top of all these we add that inequality foster political instability and discourages investment we get a full picture of harm done by inequality. Unfortunately, all these fly in the face of sound social relationship and significantly hurt development.

Sustainable development theory implies that people have lost their sense of belonging to nature and only reviving the long-gone ethic can restore balance between the environment and human kind. But this logic actually goes well beyond the human-natural matrix. The notion of relationships between various spheres of human life lies at the very centre of sustainable development and people have to realize the multitude of relationships they are conditioned by. In a more general scientific context it means that human and economic development are not solely a product of economic factors, but also subject to a wide spectrum of social, political as well as, let it be, cultural determinants. A number of authors [inter alia Harrison and Huntington, 2000] recognize the role of cultural factors in the creation of conditions conducive to the economic development of nations. Culture and values they promote are regarded as the key to the

³ The author tries to verify the following four theories/hypotheses on the subject: high inequality leads to under-investments in education (advocated by economist Joseph Stiglitz), high inequality leads to policies that hurt growth, high inequality leads to lower levels of consumer spending, and inequality can lead to credit bubbles and financial crises.

⁴ Rising inequality reduced income growth for the bottom 95 percent of the US personal income distribution beginning about 1980. To maintain stable debt to income, this group's consumption-income ratio needed to decline, which did not happen through 2006, and its debt-income ratio rose dramatically, unlike the ratio for the top 5 percent.

understanding of societies and the differences between them in the light of their economic and political progress. With reference to the 2008 crisis, it turns out that cultural values may actually strongly affect perception of both problem and its analysis. Surprisingly, Americans do accept the growing income inequality. According to a survey of 27 middle- and high-income countries, including the USA [Isaacs *at al.*, 2008a], just one-third believe that the government should take responsibility for reducing income disparities, compared with more than two-thirds in the other countries surveyed. At the same time, 69 percent of Americans agreed with the statement that *people get rewarded for intelligence and skill* compared with a typical response of just 39 percent from all the countries. What's more, just 18 percent of Americans think that being born to wealth is very important in getting ahead, compared with 28 percent among all nationalities polled. The reasons are traced to the country-specific cultural values: the widespread belief in America that what matters is not equality of outcomes but the opportunity to get promoted on the basis of one's own talents and hard work. Hence, if you are rich, it is because you deserve to be rich; if you are poor, the fault probably lies in your failure to take opportunities for self-improvement. Moreover, any attempt to redistribute income by taxing the rich and providing benefits to the poor or the middle class would undermine people's incentives to reach for the brass ring – government assistance is thus suspicious and bothersome [Isaacs and Sawhill, 2008b]. In this sense, recognition of the role of culture in the creation of favorable circumstances for economic development makes one of the most powerful arguments to illustrate the mutual relationship between the economic, cultural, social and political elements as parts of the sustainable development theory. Linking various disciplines of science to explain causes and suggest ways to achieve human socio-economic progress is undoubtedly one of the most noteworthy features of the sustainable development theory.

RELATIONSHIP ECONOMICS – IS IT YET?

The recent development of economic science in recognition of the value of relationships is establishment of relationship economics. It is a very young idea (going back to 2000) which is... *a new operationalization of Coasean transaction cost economics. It explains the economic growth process, patterns of social evolution, best practices in entrepreneurship and business management, and the solutions to many controversies [...] It hypothesizes that the costs of forming and maintaining personal relationships, and the benefits of those relationships, dominate decision-making in many contexts* [Jaminet, 2005]. As of now, i.e. December 2014, the body of evidence is limited to one (!) online article hence insufficient for assessment.

Another trace of the surfacing of the idea of relationship economics is an online post by Brian Solis [2014] on how social media is transforming the world of work. It provides some interesting insights into the role of social media in the context of maintaining relationships. Their role is critical for... *humanizing the company... giving it a voice and persona. It's about empowering employees and customers. It's about conveying empathy and building a community where community is much more than belonging to something; it's about doing something together that makes belonging matter [ibid.]*. Here we can find various elements of the ideas which have been mentioned earlier in this paper either in the context of previous works of economic thought or sustainable development: search for values in business, empowerment, and community spirit.

Moreover, Solis cites some valuable insights related to the study on the role of technology with regard to Customer Relationship Management. The findings show that *the very technology meant to build relationships with customers, CRM for example, was doing anything but bringing customers closer*. This happens because *Customer Relationship Management [today] is about [marketing and] sales and not about the relationship. It's about deflecting customers and minimizing contact*. Another research cited by Solis [*ibid.*] focuses on how specifically relationship economics, and social media impact business. The results on the use of social media for business reveal that: company executives lead the way and set the standard for engagement; sharing fosters engagement and optimism; social media engagement contributes to competitive advantage. The research findings conclude: *With focus, commitment, and genuine intentions, social media becomes much more than just another marketing channel... investing in relationship economics yields significant human benefits as well. When companies invest in relationships with customers, employees, prospects and partners, they reap benefits measured in competitiveness, profitability, loyalty, and advocacy. Beyond the bottom line, organizations also evolve into truly social businesses, where technology becomes an enabler for something of greater purpose [Solis *ibid.*]*. It seems symptomatic that the business marketing and management specialists are becoming aware of the need of their bringing businesses closer to people and giving it a human face. This is what a relationship is all about. This also makes a new source of competitive advantage.

CONCLUSIONS

Economic analysis based on mathematisation has proved invaluable in conducting quantitative analysis. However, the very characteristics limited the analysis and made humanistic elements like values, culture, relationships more elusive and difficult to account for. As our awareness of the influences impacting the socio-economic sphere of human kind has significantly widened – just to

mention the rise of the idea of sustainable development, so has the range and the subject of economic analysis, to cite a rise in interest in cultural economics. These developments have undoubtedly enriched economic analysis and have attempted to restore economics to the body of social science, yet at the same time making it much more complex. Another valuable idea that can potentially significantly increase our understanding of the processes taking place within the socio-economic sphere is that of relationships. The role of human relationship in economy, their impact on the analysis and they themselves as subject to outside influence have been undervalued for a long time with notable, yet mostly forgotten analyses of Adam Smith and Karl Polanyi. Following the rise of the idea of sustainable development and its emphasis on interdependencies, relationships may potentially rise to another important field and define another resource of competitive advantage.

Economics, just like sustainable development, is defined in terms of relationships. Although the financial crisis of 2008 flew in the face of sustainable development paradigm, it has paradoxically shown the importance of human values and relationships. We have come to a moment when we should basically rethink what values and relationships drive our lives and economy. We need a fundamental change in approach to human being restore its proper place in economy – the place which has been taken away by market maximization of profit and undermining the value of work. Ethics, genuine intentions, commitment, focus on cooperation, and after all fostering relationships, do enhance market value and guard off another economic downturn. Paraphrasing a well-known statement by Milton Friedman, crisis is always and everywhere a human-induced phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- Árnason V., 2010, Moral Analysis of an Economic Collapse—An Exercise in Practical Ethics, “Etikk i praksis. Nordic Journal of Applied Ethics”, No. 4 (1).
- Batie S., 1989, *Sustainable Development: Challenges to the Profession of Agricultural Economics*, “American Journal of Agricultural Economics”, Vol. 71, No. 5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1243090>
- Berg A.G., Ostry Jonathan D., 2011, *Equality and Efficiency*, “Finance & Development”, Vol. 48, No. 3.
- Bernstein J., 2013, *The Impact of Inequality on Growth*, Center for American Progress, Washington.
- Bertrand M., Morse A., 2013, *Trickle-Down Consumption*, NBER Working Paper No. 18883, National Bureau of Economic Research, accessed 12 November 2014 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w18883>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2237640>
- Bordo M.D., Meissner Ch.M., 2012. *Does inequality lead to a financial crisis?*, “Journal of International Money and Finance”, Elsevier, Vol. 31(8), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jimonfin.2012.05.006>

- Crash course*, 2013 September 7, “The Economist”, accessed 27 November 2014, <http://www.economist.com/news/schoolsbrief/21584534-effects-financial-crisis-are-still-being-felt-five-years-article>
- Curtis G., 2008, *The Financial Crisis and the Collapse of Ethical Behavior*, Greycourt White Paper No. 44, Greycourt & Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, PA. accessed 11 November 2014 <http://www.greycourt.com/whitepapers/WhitePaper044-FinancialCrisis.pdf>
- Cynamon B.Z., Fazzari S.M., 2015, *Inequality, the Great Recession, and Slow Recovery*, “Cambridge Journal of Economics” 39 (4), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cje/bev016>
- Dougherty P.J., 2002, *Who’s Afraid of Adam Smith? How the Market Got its Soul*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.
- Enough blame to go around*, 2013 September 30, “The Economist”, accessed 27 November 2014, http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2008/09/the_bailout_and_the_elite
- Isaacs J.B., Sawhill I.V., Haskins R., 2008a, *Getting Ahead or Losing Ground: Economic Mobility In America*, The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Isaacs J., Sawhill I., 2008b, *Reaching for the Prize: The Whole Truth About Economic Mobility*, Milken Institute Review, 4th Quarter.
- Jaminet P., 2005, *Introduction to Relationship Economics*, accessed 16 November 2014 <http://www.relationshipeconomics.com/index.htm>
- Kumhof M., Rancière R., 2010, *Leveraging Inequality*, “Finance & Development”, Vol. 47, No. 4.
- Kuznets S., 1955, *Economic growth and income inequality*, “The American Economic Review”, 45(1), 1–28.
- Miller J., Jackson B., 2008 October 1, *Who Caused the Economic Crisis?* accessed on 1 December 2014 www.factcheck.org/2008/10/who-caused-the-economic-crisis/
- Persson T., Tabellini G., 1991, *Is Inequality Harmful for Growth? Theory and Evidence*. Department of Economics, UCB. UC Berkeley: Department of Economics, UCB, accessed on 24 July 2014 <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/00x7n68q>
- Polanyi K., 1944, *The Great Transformation. The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, 2001 with *Foreword* by Joseph E. Stiglitz and *Introduction* by Fred Block, Boston, Beacon Press.
- Ruckelshaus W., 1989, *Toward a sustainable world*, “Scientific American”, Vol. 261, No. 3, 166–175, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0989-166>
- Saint-Exupéry A. de, 2000, *The Little Prince*, Mariner Books.
- Smith A., 1759, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 2006, Sálvio Marcelo Soares (ed.) Metalibri, Sao Paulo, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511800153.005>
- Smith A., 1776, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 2007, J.B.Wight (ed.) Harriman House Ltd, Hampshire, <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226763750.001.0001>
- Smith V.L., 1998, *The Two Faces of Adam Smith*, “Southern Economic Journal”, Vol. 65, No. 1 (Jul., 1998), <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1061349>
- Solis B., 2014 July 10, *Relationship Economics: How Social is Transforming the World of Work*, accessed 5 November 2014 <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/article/2014>

0710161411-2293140-relationship-economics-how-social-is-transforming-the-world-of-work-infographic

Weitzner D., Darroch J., 2009, Why moral failures precede financial crises, "Critical Perspectives on International Business", Vol. 5, Issue 1/2.

Summary

The paper deals with the idea of human relationships in the context of economic development and particularly its importance for the idea of sustainable development. The very issue that relationships determine the outcomes of economy is not new. Beginning with the Founding Father of classical economics, Adam Smith who emphasized the idea that people act differently in market and nonmarket – for example family – situations to maximize their benefits. One of the most significant emphasis on the value of relationships for economic development was made by Karl Polanyi in its social embeddedness of economic systems. Today the value of relationship is gaining recognition in economics and has led to emergence of the relationships economy. Yet the most important long-term consequence of relationships is that they have become to be recognized as another critical economic and social resource and as such play a critical role in gaining competitive advantage. In this way relationships can be of critical importance not only for sustainable development but also as a measure protecting against the odds of economic downturns since they are frequently rooted in the decline of values and human relationships.

Keywords: relationships, market, values, sustainable development, culture, economy, development

Człowiek i relacje w ekonomii w perspektywie rozwoju zrównoważonego

Streszczenie

Artykuł zajmuje się kwestią relacji ludzkich w kontekście rozwoju ekonomicznego a w szczególności ich znaczeniem dla idei rozwoju zrównoważonego. Sama problematyka wpływu relacji człowieka na sytuację gospodarczą nie jest zasadniczo nowa gdyż ma swoje korzenie jeszcze w rozważaniach filozoficznych ojca ekonomii klasycznej, Adama Smitha – on to podkreślił znaczenie faktu, że w celu maksymalizacji swoich korzyści, z pobudek egoistycznych, ludzie zachowują się odmiennie w sytuacjach rynkowych i nierynkowych, na przykład rodzinnych. Jedną z najbardziej znaczących pod tym względem analiz była ta dokonana przez Karla Polanyi, który opisał społeczne zakorzenienie systemów gospodarczych. Obecnie wartość relacji ludzkich dopiero zyskuje uznanie w analizie ekonomicznej, co doprowadziło do powstania ekonomii relacji. Jednakże najbardziej znaczącą długoterminową konsekwencją zwrócenia uwagi na relacje jest uznanie ich kolejnym istotnym zasobem społecznym i gospodarczym, który pełni zasadniczą rolę w uzyskaniu przewagi i względem konkurencji. W ten sposób relacje mogą potencjalnie odegrać znaczącą rolę nie tylko dla rozwoju zrównoważonego, ale również jako środek ograniczający możliwość wystąpienia kryzysów gospodarczych. Dzieje się tak ze względu na fakt, że często upatruje się ich przyczyn w upadku wartości i związków ludzkich.

Słowa kluczowe: relacje, rynek, wartości, rozwój zrównoważony, kultura, gospodarka, rozwój

JEL: Z1, Z13, B1, G1 O10