

**UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI”
CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE STUDII EUROPENE
ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ PARADIGMA EUROPEANĂ**

Reciprocity, an interdisciplinary approach

THESIS SUMMARY

PhD Head Master:

Prof. univ.dr. Hudîțean Alexandru

PhD student:

Șargu Ioan Vladimir

2015

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION.....	7
1. Argument	7
2. Motivation	10
3. Metodology	13
4. Defiitions of Reciprocity	16
4.1. Types of Reciprocity	20
CAP.1. A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE RECIPROCITY PRINCIPLE.....	30
1.1 Reciprocity in the archaic spirituality	30
1.2. Reciprocity in ancient India.	33
1.3 .Reciprocity in ancient China	36
1.4. Reciprocity in ancient Greece	42
1.5. Reciprocity in Judaism.	47
1.6. Reciprocity in Renassauce and Modern Times	56
CAP. 2. THE NORM OF RECIPROCITY IN THE PHILOSOPHICALL THINKING....	64
2.1. The philosophical sense of reciprocity	64
2.2. Reciprocity, redefinition possibility of human kind	69
2.3. Negative reciprocity, tyranny	70
2.4. Ethics, morality and reciprocity	71
2.4.a. Generalization.....	71
2.4.b Reciprocity in normative ethics.....	73
2.4.c Reciprocity in the applied ethics	75
2.4.d Moral expectations of reciprocity	78
2.5. Reciprocity in thruthfulness and unthruthfulness.....	79
2.6. Anthropological philosophical expectations of reciprocity.....	80
2.7. Reciprocity in the political philosophy and religion	83

2.7. a Reciprocity, morality and religion.....	84
2.8. "The Silver Rule"- "The Golden Rule" (Positive statements and negative of the reciprocity principle).....	86
CAP. 3. RECIPROCITY APPROACHES IN SOCIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY	88
3.1.Resources of reciprocity approaches in sociology and psychology	88
Reciprocity in the processes and interactions within society and daily reciprocity	88
3.2.a.Individualism- the danger of reciprocity	98
3.2. b. Individual-society relation, dualism or symbiosis?.....	99
3.2.c. From individualism toward reciprocity	101
3.2.c.i A non—individualistic vision required by daily life.....	101
3.2.c.ii.The danger in losing self identity	102
3.2.c.iii.Reciprocal will in daily life	103
3.2.d. Reciprocity and the new redefinition of society.....	105
3.2.e. Reciprocal acts, reciprocal values and culture	107
3.2 .f. Ways of implementing everyday reciprocity	110
3.3.Reciprocity and human relations.....	112
3.3.a. „ <i>What have I done to deserve this?</i> ”	117
3.3.b. Reciprocity within family.....	121
3.3.c. Reciprocal family trust	122
3.3.d. Reciprocity between spouses	123
3.3.e. Parenthood and reciprocity.....	126
3.3.f. Thankfulness and everyday relations.....	129
CAP. 4. FAMOUS ANALISTS OF RECIPROCITY PRINCIPLE IN JUDICIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES DOMANIS	131
4.1 Juridical system and reciprocity	131
4.2 Reciprocity within the contemporary juridical system (John Rawls' works)	132
4.2.a. Reciprocity within the justice and moral system(John Rawls' political philosophy)	133
4.2.b. Reciprocity as disinteres (reciprocity as fairness).....	136
4.2.c. The role of reciprocity in judicial system as seen by Rawls	136
4.2.d. Justice, virtue governed by reciprocity	140

4.2.e. Rawls' observations regarding moral theory.....	144
4.2.f . Initial social goods, fundamental for expectations within a reciprocal behaviour (a discussion about expectations and ways for those to be evaluated).....	147
4.2.g. "Veil of Darkness"	154
4.2.h. Distribution –Reciprocity priority and of justice	159
4.2.i. Reciprocity of institutions and people.....	161
4.2.j. Moral subject and its purposes in relation to reciprocity	166
4.2.k. Political theory of reciprocity.....	170
4.2.l. Disinteres and consensus.....	173
4.2.m. Reciprocity and justice in Rawls' vision (Conclusions)	179
4.3 An anti-Rawlsian hypothesis (Carl Schmitt b. 11iul. 1888 – d. 7 apr. 1985)...	180
4.3.a. The doctrines of social reciprocity contract	182
4.3.b. Social union, partnership and reciprocity.....	185

CAP. 5. FAMOUS ANALISTS OF RECIPROCITY IN HUMAN SCIENCES

DOMAIN.....	190
5.1. Reciprocity and feature/functionality theory (sociology)	190
5.2. Reciprocity in community (as it derives from Jurgen Habermas' works).....	192
5.2.a. Arguments in favour of liberty priority and reciprocity	195
5.3. About reciprocity as social development engine/core.....	202
5.4. An analysis between relational psychology and reciprocal elements (David Schmidtz' works).....	211
5.4.a. Expectations (component of reciprocity) and good-luck (chance).....	213
5.4.b. Expectations and reciprocal behaviour in human relations acts	214
5.4.c. An exponent which contains a task(promise).....	219
5.4.d. Interacting components of reciprocity (Reciprocity viewed as a puzzle).221	
5.4.e. An analysis of consequences from a reciprocal view.....	224
5.5. To be worth a chance and in need for a chance (Worthy and rightfulness in James Rachels' works)	225
5.5.a. Challenge of partnership.....	233
5.6. From reciprocity philosophy to everyday reciprocity; a plea (Ruth Anna Putnam).....	234
5.7. A multidisciplinary approach of reciprocity (Lawrence C. Becker's works)..	238

5.8. An analysis of reciprocity from an anthropological view point . Schimbul reciproc de cadouri (the studies of Mauss & Geoffrey Mac Cormack)	252
5.8.a. Mutuality and reciprocity in anthropology	256
FINAL CONCLUSIONS (THE RESULTS OF PERSONAL ANALISYS).....	258
1. Social sciences and contemporary reciprocity	258
2. Reciprocity and Foreign affairs (analysis of economical treaties of reciprocity in United States history)	256
3. Reciprocity in the post imperialistic World.....	266
4. Responses to the ethical critics of reciprocity	274
5. Final notes	276
PRIMARY BIBLIOGRAPHY	279
SECONDARY BIBLIOGRAPHY	288
E-BIBLIOGRAPHY	292

KEY WORDS

RECIPROCITY,
MUTUALITY,
ETHICS,
MORALITY,
GOLDEN RULE,
SILVER RULE,
INDIVIDUALISM,
JUSTICE/FAIRNESS,
IGNORANCE VEIL,
RECIPROCAL SOCIAL CONTRACT,
INTERNATIONAL RECIPROCITY TREATIES

Reciprocity has been the subject of study within the socio-human sciences, experiments upon social and psychological development and even hypothesis within social anthropology and political theory. It also has been the subject of speculations in what is called phenomenology and structural anthropology as well as the subject for establishing treatment technics in psychology and clinical psychiatry.

In the moral philosophy it was less mentioned, eventually by the name, but its ideas about the control behind a multitude of moral theories such as retribution, thankfulness, fair play and proportional justice (chief justice).

Aproape toate scrierile despre reciprocitate, o tratează ca pe o noțiune fundamentală, ceva de o importanță centrală pentru cel puțin câteva aspecte ale vieții sociale umane.

In almost all the writings about this subject it is considered as a fundamental notion something of a significant importance for at least few aspects of social human life.

The argument offered to support these proposal is the virtue theory. This does not refer strictly to trust, rights, debts, interest, preferences, values or social goods. Instead, through the excellence of character, a part of the substantial virtue theory is proposed.

Considering all these the main topic which I addressed within my thesis are: reciprocity idea, reciprocity problem, central problem of existence, reciprocity concepts starting from definitions of references, theoretical perspectives on approaching reciprocity: philosophical, ethical, judicial, sociological, anthropological, social psychological (pro-reciprocity behavior), paradigms, theories and modules. I chose an analytical approach of above mentioned domains in hand of identifying interactions of fundamental correlation in explanation and manifestation of reciprocity toward a holistic, interdisciplinary unitary approach.

In order to present a coherent presentation of what it means reciprocity, precisely reciprocal behaviour for people and the way these aspects govern our lives, I chose to divide my thesis as follows :

Introduction. Following a close examination of the written resources on reciprocity principle I discovered that although the subject is mentioned in a multitude of works in domains such as philosophy, psychology, law, anthropology it is not examined/considered independently; the International professional literature with few exceptions which I considered in this thesis, is lacking specific analysis regarding reciprocity features/characteristics even more the resources which consider reciprocity principle interdisciplinary do not exist.

Starting from the empirical reality I observed a major deficit of reciprocity in interpersonal relations.

Thus, in writing this thesis my release point was an analysis of reciprocity and the empiric reality as well as the analysis of interpersonal relations within family, school, work place/job; the types of relations in which reciprocity plays evidently an important role were the subjects analyzed present in larger means characterized by human relations which have at the core the principle of reciprocity. Here I incorporate *facto* situations within a community divided administratively, even if we consider a town, with the included rural and urban differences or an administrative local unit as well as the present political domain, elected-electors relation. The last two situations proved to be characterized/impacted by lack of reciprocity either if we are talking about mere examples of breaking the electoral promises or misuse of funds by territorial administrative units from community.

Considering the multitude and the diversity of situations met in different domains: psychology, law, sociology, anthropology I reached the conclusion/belief that a multidisciplinary approach, in theory, in my case could be a resource of quality improvement in human relationships in what concerns reciprocity in the plan of real life, social life of community and of interpersonal relationships.

At the institutional level I discovered that there's a necessity in including reciprocity as a part, component of sustainability and efficiency in organizational culture in professional groups, institutions, communities, observing an educational deficit from this point of view.

Methodology. Next to the means of philosophy, always renewed, enriched, gradated by each philosopher next to those quality methods in socio-human and behavioral sciences I considered important the correlation and methodological interference in the inter and multidisciplinary approach for which we continue to have perspectives for reciprocity in different domains such as: social, anthropological, psychological and the interaction among them.

The methodology which I used within this present thesis is intended to analyze, criticize or remake, to adapt empirical relations through the light of reciprocity as the prototype of human life.

The multidisciplinary context emerges from the multitude of domains for which the reciprocity concept is relevant and thus, there are different definitions which are given to it. Among those I analysed the ones from Larousse dictionary where the definitions given to reciprocity are the following: a mutual exchange of commercial privileges or of different nature, a mutual relation of dependency, an action or influence, mutual action and reaction,

advantages, engagements or mutual rights, a way to/of change in which transactions took place among individuals symmetrically distribute and which are making this exchange as equal parts, none of them considering a superior position, a dependence relation/connection, action, mutual influence.

In chapter 1 of the thesis I present a succinct history of reciprocity. As an ethical principle, reciprocity was passed on from parents and elders to youngsters on verbal communication but as the society had learned to use the written word they begun writing these moral codes, becoming the first historical proofs of importance given to the reciprocity principle. Thus, in this chapter I designed a systematic introduction of historical resources of reciprocity analyzing chronologically the relevance of reciprocity begging with the most ancient resources all the way from the ancient Egyptian civilization, Mesopotamia, India, China, Confucius's times and continuing with ancient Greece, Judaism, followed by Renaissance age and closing with contemporaneity.

In order to have a better understanding of the importance played by the presented view point of reciprocity dated all the way to the ancient age, the opinion which stands at the base of all further opinions expressed in relation to reciprocal principal and behavior, I arrived at a compared analysis to the way in which it was considered reciprocity in Confucianism and in Rabbinic ethics. In chapter 2 titled "*the norm of reciprocity in the philosophical thinking*" I studied the way in which reciprocity was found in philosophy through the introduction of different forms/approaches in which this is revealed by the diverse branches of ethics as well as in morality.

Reciprocity in normative ethics. Traditionally normative ethics known as moral theory had been the study of/in what exactly makes actions right or wrong. These theories offer a moral hierarchical principle which will draw many people to consider it whenever they will in search of solving the difficult moral decisions.

I continued presenting the different moral perspectives of reciprocity. Examples of moral codes which include the *Golden Rule* there are so called "The Five Percepts" and "The Noble Cause of Eightfold in Buddhism"; in the ancient Egypt it is "Maat Code"; "The Ten Commandments from Judaism, Christianity and Islam"; "Yama and Niamey from the Hindu Writings" and "The Ten Indian Commandments".

Also, I analyzed/review so called negative form of reciprocity named "The Silver Rule". Connected to the ethical principle regarding The Golden Rule, the Silver one is the most known as the following statement: "Do not do to others as you will not want them to be doing to you" and similar other statements. Some of these statements found in philosophical and

religious literature are considered versions of the Golden Rule; there are controversies tied/relating the idea according to which the Golden Rule and The Silver Rule should be considered as different expressions of the same idea or if they were different from the logical view point, ethical or practical.

In their attempt to understand the world, historians, philosophers, writers, psychologists have confronted with the problems of the man living in the society such as: problem of conflicts, of interpersonal communication, of relationship, reception, interpreting of information (controlling), inter/transgenerational conflicts and have tried to analyses them, to offer solutions.

The following chapter (3) I devoted to the way in which reciprocity emerge within sociological and social psychological domains with a focus on its impact on processes and interactions from society and the level of daily life. Reciprocity is a quality and a specific value of human relations. In a larger sense it defines the man kind in society as it appears in Buber Martin and Van Peursen works.

It could be said that in the reciprocal relations man finds superior ways of communication to/from the multitude of roles played by him/her.

In my preliminary studies I discovered that the so called marketing of human relations doubled by the alteration of relations between groups and people bring/carry with themselves the danger that together with the old types of relations and of content/enclose to loose also the quality of the relations. This will apply to the statement “small man in a large society” as well as to the one who holds a position in the society.

Una dintre concluziile capitolului 3 este o pledoarie pentru o „atitudine reciprocă” în viața de zi cu zi dar și în relația individ-societate, individ-instituții.

Our attention should be directed toward the new ways in modern philosophy within its efforts made in order to reach to a reciprocal attitude excluding the peril mentioned above, perils which these kind of reciprocal relations/connections could offer. Furthermore this analysis of philosophical tendencies must remain brief/short.

Especially interesting have been the results of the analysis upon the modern/common question of the modern man (in particular): *What have I done to deserve this?* Skeptics insist that in order to deserve anything, work, even the harder one, is not sufficient. We also have to deserve the credit which is offered to us in order to be destine to labor hard.

Chapter 3 continues according to the reciprocity definitions from our first chapter together with the way families need to be structured in such a way to encourage reciprocity. If they hurt it or inhibit they need to change their existential structure. This looks like we need to

bring those family rules, the ones which occur within the family context in accordance with reciprocity. Reciprocity between spouses encourages maximum of reciprocity, a special analysis being given to existent relations between reciprocity and parenthood.

The thesis continues with chapters 4 and 5 which have a similar objective thus, the analysis upon the famous analysts' work for reciprocity principle in judicial and political science domains in chapter 4 and of those from the social sciences (social psychology, sociology, anthropology) in chapter 5.

Chapter 4 considers reciprocity in relation to judicial system (according to Rawls John' works February 21. 1921 – Nov. 24. 2002) due to the fact that the standard use of the word justice proofs the close connection to the reciprocity concept. Judiciary includes the idea of justice which at its turn includes similar resolution of similar cases offering to people what they deserve and graduating the benefices and debts in an equal way. Furthermore, these aspects imply actions lead by impartial principles which forbid taking parts and could demand sacrifices. All these are led by elements of reciprocity tided to proportionality and matching but it proved to be difficult in explaining precise actions.

Rawls book „A theory of Justice” (1971, second edition 1999) proposed a new conception about reciprocity as being similar with justice, righteousness as impartiality (justice as fairness) whose principles established a new moral ideal beyond de different acceptations of individual or colective good. If traditionally the political speech about reciprocity was influenced by theological doctrines of Aristotelian background/origins, Rawls will search to discover if it is possible to find a right and reasonable criterion of righteousness which should be neuter in connection to our moral doctrines, religious or philosophical all these proving to be reciprocity itself. Begging from the question (which is the leitmotiv of his entire work) in what way could we find which is the most appropriate moral conception about justice for a democratic society, Rawls will build the theoretical endeavor as an alternative to the utilitarian conception which had dominated the ethics and social philosophy for over two centuries. The solution proposed by the utilitarists was not sufficient from the moral view point because people could be easily treated in the name of “maximum happiness” as means to accomplish different commune purposes.

David Schmitz (b. 1955) – elements of reciprocity, we believe that people should obtain what they deserve but why do we believe that any man should deserve anything? We believe that we deserve the excellent recognition of our work but not for that which constitutes a mere luck. As it was mentioned in Rawls works our puzzle is this: our ability to accomplish an excellent thing is simple luck; our social circumstances, our talents and even nature, our

personality are the results of nature and food for which we don't have how to pretend recognition, merits.

În selecția celor a căror operă am studiat-o m-am confruntat în câteva cazuri cu situația unor personalități care în opera lor au exprimat și ei un punct de vedere interdisciplinar privitor la principiul reciprocității. Între aceștia poate că cei pe care i-am studiat în amănunt sunt: Ruth Anna Putnam care face în publicațiile sale o pledoarie de la filosofia reciprocă la reciprocitatea cotidiană și Lawrence Backer care este considerat pionierul studiului reciprocității ca și subiect independent, bază a funcționalității și autorul volumului "Reciprocity" care a fost unul din punctele de pornire pentru teza de față.

Reciprocitatea este o carte extraordinară- îi obligă pe cititorii săi să regândească câteva dintre chestiunile importante abordate de filozofia modernă recentă. Reciprocitatea este, pe de altă parte, o carte care dezamăgește; găsește rezolvarea câtorva probleme mult prea lesne însă nu reușește să exploateze la maximum resursele unei abordări teoretice a virtuții. Se remarcă existența unei tensiuni între dorința filozofilor pentru simplitate și claritate precum și conștientizarea sensibilă a individului în ceea ce privește complexitatea și opacitatea vieților noastre morale; de asemenea, între dorința teoreticianului de a pune fundația comportamentului moral în caracter și ideea (Kantiană) că aceea conduită morală trebuie să fie o chestiune de onoare, datorie.

Pentru analiza reciprocității din punct de vedere al antropologiei am studiat opera a doi antropologi : Mauss (respectiv lucrarea „the Gift”) și Geoffrey Mac Corma- Schimbul reciprocității de cadouri.

Teza (dizertația) fundamentală a lui Becker este criteriul logic al rezumatului pentru „ o teorie generală a moralității” a condus spre o „teorie a virtuții (teorie a excelenței)” bazată pe reciprocitate. Cu toate acestea, definiția sa despre reciprocitate se diferențiază tocmai de majoritatea teoriei psihologiei sociale și a teoriei jocurilor .Pentru autor, reciprocitatea trebuie să fie „(pre)dispoziția” către reversibilitatea beneficiilor primite, fie că acestea au fost sau nu cerute; acest gen de reciprocitate nu are nevoie să fie minuțios (răs)”plătită” în același fel, însă o găsim în asimetria dintre bine și rău. După spusele lui Becker, în timp ce „binelui primit ar trebui să i se plătească cu bine” citate în legătură cu răul sunt destul de diferite: „pentru răul primit ar trebui să nu se întoarcă aceeași monedă” și „ răului primit ar trebui să i se opună rezistență”

Teza se încheie cu secțiunea dedicată concluziilor rezultate în urma cercetării personale și se centrează îndeosebi pe trei idei: științele sociale și reciprocitatea în contemporaneitate,

reciprocitatea și politica externă(cu o analiză practică a tratatelor de reciprocitate economică din istoria SUA) și contracarez criticile aduse eticii reciprocității.

Științele sociale, în zilele noastre, funcționează guvernate de conceptele care le-au definit. Vorbim despre universal la fel ca și de principii operaționale generale dar, rareori devine clar ce înțelegem prin aceste principii conform cu noi, subiecții, care operăm într-o societate, avem de-a face cu fapte din viața socială, un obiect poate sau principiile așa cum sunt ele definite ca și observații în realitatea socio-culturală sau a cuiva care observă un subiect, o parte concepută ca și un ceva în operare.

Scopul spre care am ținut cu prezenta teză este să dezbat modul în care această situație ar putea veni în concordanță mai mare cu zilele noastre și eliminarea riscurilor care au fost descrise. Acesta este conceptul reciprocității în viața de zi cu zi.

Pentru aceasta am luat în considerare acel înțeles conform căruia reciprocitatea, atunci când a fost concepută, avea un obiectiv universal. Lucrurile sunt reciproce. Pentru a exista, lucrurile trebuie să fie reciproce. Este versiunea pozitivă a celebrei zicale: "nu face altuia ceea ce nu vrei să ți se facă ție". Este ceea ce la un moment dat la mijlocul secolului trecut susțineau afișele din vechile orașe germane în locurile publice.

Referitor la analiza legăturii între reciprocitatea și politica externă și cea dintre reciprocitatea și tratatele de cooperare economică am pornit de la faptul ca Statele Unite a fost țara care a transpus principiul reciprocității în practică prin intermediul principiului clauzei națiunii cele mai favorizate, care a fost parte integrată a fiecărui tratat comercial negociat în perioada 1778-1922. Aceasta nu însemna neapărat o politică de excludere, dar cerea în permanență o continuare a negocierilor după ce o astfel de înțelegere a fost ratificată și a putut duce la practici discriminatorii. Termenul de "reciprocitate restrictivă" poate fi de asemenea aplicat înțelegerilor care afectează doar un număr limitat de obiective și păstrează situații de discriminare prohibitivă intacte.

Deși de multe ori în formularea unei teze criticii acelei idei sunt ignorați, eu am considerat important ca, pe lângă punctele exprimate în capitolele de informare privitor la diferitele vederi/părerii despre reciprocitate de-a lungul istoriei, să încerc să ofer și în partea finală a concluziilor răspunsuri la criticile eticii reciprocității.

Mulți au fost cei care au criticat reciprocitatea (referindu-se mai ales la forma sa "regula de aur"). Astfel, George Bernard Shaw spunea cândva că "regula de aur este aceea că nu există reguli de aur". Filozofi, ca și Immanuel Kant, Friedrich Nietzsche și Bertrand Russell, au obiectat la această regulă bazându-se pe diferite argumente. Cele mai serioase între acestea se referă la aplicabilitatea ei practică.

În concluzia finală a tezei am avansat ideea că schimbul interuman poartă o dimensiune simbolică ce este legată, pe de-o parte, de premisele culturale pe baza cărora este stabilită logica reciprocității și, pe de altă parte, de modul în care reciprocitatea se dovedește un proces de formare a diferențelor și identificărilor precum și de rezolvare a opozițiilor. Reciprocitatea devine în mod particular, clară ca un proces de alcătuire simbolică printre membrii unei comunități când este percepută ca o schemă de acțiune sau scenariu. Aici este implicată interpretarea evenimentelor și formularea acțiunii în relația cu ele. Încorporează un simț al proporției ce este împărțit la scară socială, o ideologie și un set de presupuneri și așteptări ce formează fundamentul pe care aceștia îl folosesc să rezolve multe situații diferite, atât în interiorul cât și în afara contextului de schimb. Reciprocitatea implică un punct de vedere strategic de la care societate umană conceptualizează sub toate aspectele atât definițiile sociale cât și diferențele cosmologice și formularea relațiilor între ele. Ca atare, structura lumii nu este doar fundamentul conceptual pentru reciprocitatea comunității oamenilor, dar și, în parte, rezultatul ei. Accentul pe aspectele cognitiv-interpretative ale reciprocității completează abordările filosofice, juridice, sociologice și economice (sau "alegerea rațională") a ceea ce înseamnă schimburile interumane.

BIBLIOGRAFIE SELECTIVĂ

- ❖ Alvin W, Gouldner, The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement, American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Apr., 1960), pp. 161-178, American Sociological Association.
- ❖ Andreas, Diekmann, The Power of Reciprocity: Fairness, Reciprocity, and Stakes in Variants of the Dictator Game, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 48, No. 4 (Aug., 2004), pp. 487-505, Sage Publications, Inc.
- ❖ Anne, Warfield Rawls and Gary David, Accountably Other: Trust, Reciprocity and Exclusion in a Context of Situated Practice, DavidSource: Human Studies, Vol. 28, No. 4 (Oct., 2005), pp. 469-497, Springer.
- ❖ Andrew J, Weigert, Alfred Schutz on a Theory of Motivation, The Pacific Sociological Review, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 83-102, University of California Press, Jan., 1975.
- ❖ Aristotel, Politics; Book III, Chap. 12, 1282 b.
- ❖ Aristotel, op. Cit., V, IV, 1132A 20, Editura Didactică și pedagogică, 1974.
- ❖ Aristotel - Etica Nicomahică: Cartea a VI-a
- ❖ Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Books VIII and IX (1155 – 1172 a) Friendship and reciprocity Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ Arneson, Richard J.: Arneson on Anderson, brown Electronic Article Review Service (BEARS), 1999.
- ❖ Axelrod, Robert: *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books, 1984. revised edition 2006. Barry, B. *The Liberal Theory of Justice* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1971).
- ❖ Barry, B.: *Theories of Justice*, London, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989.
- ❖ Barry, B.: *Justice as Impartiality* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1999).
- ❖ Barry, Brian. : *A Treatise on Social Justice*. Volume I: Theories of Justice. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- ❖ Bauman, Z. : *Postmoderne Ethik*, Hamburg, Hamburger Edition, 1995.
- ❖ Becker, Lawrence C. : „Recipricity, Justice, and Disability”. *Ethics*, 116(1):9-39, 2005.
- ❖ Becker, Lawrence C, : a. „The Obligation to Work”, *ethics*, 91:35-49, Chicago University Press, 1980.
- ❖ Becker, Lawrence C.: b „Reciprocity and Social Obligation”, *Pacific Philosophical quarterly* 61: 411-21, 1980.

- ❖ Becker, Lawrence C. *Reciprocity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- ❖ Becker, Lawrence C.: „Afterword: Disability, Strategic Action, and Reciprocity”, 1988.
- ❖ Blau, Peter M: *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- ❖ Benhabib, S. (1992), *Situating the Self. Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- ❖ Buchanan, Allen: „Justice As Reciprocity vs. Subject-Centered Justice”. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 19/9 (1990) : 227/52.
- ❖ Brennan, J. : „Rawls’s Paradox”, University of Arizona, 2005.
- ❖ Brian, Redhead : *Plato to Nato*, BBC Books, 1990.
- ❖ Bruni, Luigino : *Reciprocity altruism & civil society*, London 2005.
- ❖ Cauc Ion, Manu Beatrice, Pârlea Danila, Goran Laura: *Metodologia cercetării sociologice: metode și tehnici de cercetare*, Ediția a II-a, București, Editura Fundației România de Mâine, 2004.
- ❖ Catherine Chase Goodman, *Reciprocity among Older Adult Peers*, *The Social Service Review*, Vol. 59, No. 2 pp. 269-282, The University of Chicago Press, Jun. 1985.
- ❖ Christine, Taylor and Martin, A. Nowak: *Transforming the Dilemma*, *Evolution*, Vol. 61, No. 10 (Oct., 2007), pp. 2281-2292 „Society for the Study of Evolution.
- ❖ Clifford Sifton, *Reciprocity*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 45, *Canadian National Problems* ,pp. 20-28 Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Jan., 1913.
- ❖ Colleen Leahy Johnson, *Gift Giving and Reciprocity among the Japanese Americans in Honolulu*, *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 1, No. 2 pp. 295-308, Published by: Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the American Anthropological Association, (May, 1974).
- ❖ Confucius – *Analecte*, Editura Humanitas, 1995.
- ❖ David, Schmidtz: *What We Deserve, and How We Reciprocate*, *The Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 9, No. 3/4, Devoted to James Rachels, pp. 435-464, 2005, Springer.
- ❖ Daniels, N., (ed.): *Reading Rawls* Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1975.
- ❖ Dunca, Isadora Ioana : *Politica și metapolitica la Platon/Politics to Plato*, Editura Lumen, Iași, România .
- ❖ David, A. Reidy: *Reciprocity and Reasonable Disagreement: From Liberal to Democratic Legitimacy*, *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, Vol. 132, No. 2 (Jan., 2007), pp. 243-291: Springer.

- ❖ Dunca, Isadora Ioana : *Politica și metapolitica la Platon / Politics to Plato*, Editura Lumen, Iași, România
- ❖ Dworkin, R.: "Foundations of Liberal Equality", în *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol.XI, Grethe B. Peterson (ed.) ,Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press, 1990.
- ❖ Dworkin, R. :*A Matter of Principle*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986.
- ❖ Edward L. ,Schieffelin: *Reciprocity and the Construction of Reality*, Man, New Series, Vol. 15, No. 3 pp. 502-517, Published by: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, (Sep., 1980).
- ❖ Ernst, T.: *Aspecte ale semnificației schimbului și schimbul de lucruri printre Onabasalu de pe Marele Platau Papuan. În Comerțul și schimbul în Oceania și Australia*, Editura humanitas 1995.
- ❖ Furley, David - *Routledge History of Philosophy Vol II From Aristotle to Augustine*, 2011, Springer.
- ❖ Galston W.: "Two Concepts of Liberalism", *Ethics*, vol. 105, 3, 1995.
- ❖ Galston, William A.: *Justice and the Human Good*. Chicago: university of Chicago Press, 1980.
- ❖ Gibbard, Allan: " Constructing Justice". *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 20 , 1991, Springer.
- ❖ Gilbert, Roberts: *Competitive Altruism From Reciprocity to the Handicap Principle*, *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 265, No. 1394 (Mar. 7, 1998), pp. 427-431, The Royal Society.
- ❖ Gill ,Christopher : *Postlethwaite Norman :Reciprocity in ancient Greece*.
- ❖ Geoffrey MacCormack, *Reciprocity*, Man, New Series, Vol. 11, No. 1 , pp. 89-103, Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, Mar., 1976.
- ❖ Gouldner, Alvin: „The Norm of Reciprocity”. *American Sociological Review* 25 1960.
- ❖ Gudrun von Tevenar: *Gratitude, Reciprocity, and Need* Author, *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 2 ,pp. 181-188 Published by: University of Illinois Press ,North American Philosophical Publications, Apr., 2006.
- ❖ Gretchen B. Rossman: 'I Owe You One': Considerations of Role and Reciprocity in a Study of Graduate Education for School Administrator *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 3, Research Dilemmas in Administration and Policy Settings pp. 225-234, Blackwell Publishing the American Anthropological Associations, 1984.

- ❖ Hana, Filip and Gregory N. Carlson: Distributivity Strengthens Reciprocity, Collectivity Weakens It, *Linguistics and Philosophy*, Vol. 24, No. 4 ,Aug., 2001, pp. 417-466, Springer.
- ❖ Hare, R. M.: „Ethical Theory and Utilitarianism”, in Sen and Williams, eds. *Utilitarianism and Beyond*. 23-38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- ❖ Habermas, J. :Citizenship and National Identity”, *Praxis International*, 192,12, 1992.
- ❖ Harman, Gilbert.. „Ethics and Observation”, in Geoffrey Sayre- McCord, ed. *Essays on Moral Realism*.119 –24. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Pres, 1998.
- ❖ Heath, Anthony. Alegețile raționale și schimbul social: o critică la teoria schimbului. Cambridge: Univ. Press. Kapferer, Bruce (ed.). 1976. Tranzacția și semnificația. Philadelphia: Institutul pentru Studiul Chestiunilor Umane
- ❖ Hugo, Victor: *Les Miserables*, Paris:Hetzel Publishers, 1988.
- ❖ Harman, Gilbert : „Ethics and Observation”, in Geoffrey Sayre- McCord, ed. *Essays on Moral Realism*.119 –24. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- ❖ Hirschman, A. :*Passions and Interests*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1977.
- ❖ Honneth, A. :*The Struggle for Recognition*, Cambridge Polity Press, 1995.
- ❖ Horowitz, Maryanna - *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas Vol 1*
- ❖ Hume, D. :*A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. D.F. Norton și M.J. Norton, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- ❖ J. Specht & J. P. White: *Omenirea II*, Feld, Steven n.d. *Povestea despre cacadu și pescăruș*, 1997.
- ❖ Jeremy Moss, 'Mutual Obligation' and 'New Deal': Illegitimate and Unjustified?, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, Vol. 9, No. 1, Feb., 2006, pp. 87-104, Springer.
- ❖ John R. Deckop, Carol C. Cirka, Lynne M. Andersson, *Doing Unto Others: The Reciprocity of Helping Behavior in Organizations*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 47, No. 2 ,Oct., 2003, pp. 101-113, Springer.
- ❖ Joseph P. Schultz: *Reciprocity in Confucian and Rabbinic Ethics*, *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), pp. 143-150, Journal of Religious Ethics, Inc.
- ❖ James C. Cox, Daniel Friedman, Vjollca Sadiraj, *Revealed Altruism*, *Econometrica*, Vol. 76, No. 1 (Jan., 2008), pp. 31-69: The Econometric Society.
- ❖ Kant, I. :*Critique of Pure Reason*, N. Kemp Smith trans., New York, St. Martin's, 1969.

- ❖ Katrina, M. Powell and Pamela Takayoshi: Accepting Roles Created for Us: The Ethics of Reciprocity, *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 54, No. 3 Feb., 2003, pp. 394-422, National Council of Teachers of English.
- ❖ Kelly, P., "Justifying «justice»: contractarianism, communitarianism and the foundations of contemporary liberalism" în D. Boucher și P. Kelly (ed.) *The Social Contract from Hobbes to Rawls*, London, Routledge, 1994.
- ❖ Kervegan, J-F: *Hegel, Carl Schmitt. Le politique entre speculation et positive*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1993.
- ❖ Kukathas, Ch., Pettit, Ph.: *Rawls: A Theory of Justice and Its Critics*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1990.
- ❖ Kukathas, Ch., Pettit, Ph., *Rawls: A Theory of Justice and Its Critics* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1999.
- ❖ Kuhlmann, W. (ed) :*Moralitat und Sittlichkeit. Das Problem Hegels und die Diskursethik*, Frankfurt, Suhrkamp, 1986.
- ❖ Kummer, Hans: „Evolutionary Transformation of Possessive behaviour”, *Journal of Social Behaviour and personality*, 1991.
- ❖ Kymlicka, W.: "The return of the citizen", *Ethics*, vol.104, 2,1994.
- ❖ Kymlicka, W., *Liberalism, Community and Culture* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.
- ❖ Lemmermeyer, F. :*Reciprocity Laws - From Euler to Eisenstein - Springer*, 2000.
- ❖ Linda, D. Molm, David R. Schaefer, Jessica L. Collett: The Value of Reciprocity, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 70, No. 2 ,Jun., 2007, pp. 199-217, American Sociological Association.
- ❖ Lomasky, Loren , "Libertarianism at Twin Harvard", *Social Philosophy and Policy*22: 178- 99, 2005.
- ❖ Malinowski, Bronislaw :*Argonauții din Pacificul de vest*. London: Routledge & Kegan Pau, 1922.
- ❖ Mauss, Marcel :*Darul/cadoul: forme și funcții/roluri ale schimbului în societățile arhaice*, 1925.
- ❖ Martin A. Nowak and Sébastien Roch: Upstream Reciprocity and the Evolution of Gratitude, *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 274, No. 1610 Mar. 7, 2007, pp. 605-609, The Royal Society.
- ❖ McCarthy, T.: "Kantian Constructivism and Reconstructivism:Rawls and Habermas in Dialogue", *Ethics*, 105, 1, 1994.
- ❖ McConnel, Terrance: *Gratitude*. Philadelphia:Template University Press, 1993.

- ❖ MacIntyre, A. :*After Virtue*, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.
- ❖ MacIntyre, A.:*Whose Justice? Which rationality?*, London, Duckworth, 1988.
- ❖ Macpherson, C.B. :*The Political Theory of Possesive Individualism. Hobbes to Locke*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1962.
- ❖ Martin R.:*Rawls and Rights* (Lawrence, University of Kansas Press, 1985.
- ❖ Michael Moody, Serial Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement, *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 26, No. 2 ,Jun., pp. 130-151, American Sociological Association, 2008.
- ❖ Mill, John Stuart: *One Liberty*. Harmondsworth:Penguin, 1974.
- ❖ Mill, John Stuart. 1979 (1861) *Utilitarianism*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett
- ❖ Mulhall S., Swift, A., *Liberals & Communitarians* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1992.
- ❖ Montesquieu :*De l'esprit des lois*, ed. Victor Goldschmidt, Paris, Flammarion, 1993.
- ❖ Mouffe, C.:”John Rawls: A Political Philosophy without Politics”, in D. Rasmussen, (ed.) *Universalism versus Communitarianism*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1990.
- ❖ Nagel, T. :*Equality and Partiality*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991.
- ❖ Nagel, Thomas „Rawls on Justice”, in Daniels, eds. *Reading Rawls*. 1-16. Standford, CA: Standford University Press, 1989.
- ❖ Naoki Masuda and Hisashi Ohtsuki, Tag-Based Indirect Reciprocity by Incomplete Social Information, *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 274, No. 1610 ,Mar. 7, 2007, pp. 689-695, The Royal Society.
- ❖ Nietzsche, Friedrich: *On the Genealogy of Morals*. New York:Vintage books, 1969.
- ❖ Okin, S. :*Justice, Gender and the Family*, New York, Basic Books, 1989.
- ❖ Olof Leimar and Peter Hammerstein: Evolution of Cooperation through Indirect Reciprocity, *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 268, No. 1468 Apr. 7, 2001.pp. 745-753, The Royal Society.
- ❖ O'Neill, O. :*Constructions of Reason*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- ❖ O'Neill, O.: *Towards Justice and Virtue* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- ❖ Paul Eder, Karl Aquino, Carl Turner, Americus Reed, II: Punishing Those Responsible for the Prison Abuses at Abu Ghraib: The Influence of theNegative Reciprocity Norm (NRN), *Political Psychology*, Vol. 27, No. 6 Dec., 2006, pp. 807-821 International Society of Political Psychology.
- ❖ Pogge, T.: *Realizing Rawls* ,Ithaca, Cornell Iniversity Press, 1989.

- ❖ Plato, :*Republic*, Books I, II. The problem of returning harm for harm (335a-335e) Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ Plato, *Crito*: Gratitude and obedience to law, Springer.
- ❖ Platon : *Republica*, Editura Antet, 2006.
- ❖ Peter Kosso and Cynthia Kosso, Central Place Theory and the Reciprocity between Theory and Evidence, *Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 62, No. 4 ,Dec., 1995, pp. 581-598, The University of Chicago Press the Philosophy of Science Association.
- ❖ Peter, Danielson: Competition among Cooperators: Altruism and Reciprocity, National Academy of Sciences.
- ❖ Radu, I. (coord.): *Introducere în psihologia contemporană*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Sincron, 1991.
- ❖ Reinharz, S.: *Feminist Methods in Social Research*, New York: Oxford University Press, . 1992.
- ❖ Rawls, John.: *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- ❖ Rawls, John: *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- ❖ Rawls, John: *A Theory of Justice*. Revised ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- ❖ Rawls, J.: "Reply to Alexander and Musgrave", *Quartely Journal of Economics*, vol. 88, 1974.
- ❖ Rawls, J.. "Social Unity and Primary Goods", în Sen, A.K., Williams, B., (ed.) *Utilitarianism and Beyond* ,Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- ❖ Rawls, J.: "Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical", în Avineri, S., de-Shalit, A. (ed.), *Communitarianism and Individualism* ,Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992.
- ❖ Rawls, John.: *Justice as Fairness: a Restatement*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard Universitz Press, 2001.
- ❖ Rawls, J.: *Political Liberalism* ,New York, Columbia University Press, 1993.
- ❖ Rawls, J.: *A Theory of Justice* ,Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1999.
- ❖ Rawls, J. : *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1971.
- ❖ Rawls John - *Law of Peoples-Some of the Important Themes and Issues Raised* .
- ❖ Ricoeur, P. : *Soi-meme comme un autre*, Paris, La Seuil, 1990.
- ❖ Robbins, Edwin Clyde : *Selected articles on reciprocity*, Springer, 1986.
- ❖ Robert O. Keohane: *Reciprocity in International Relations*, *International Organization*, Vol. 40, No. 1 ,Winter, 1986, pp. 1-27, The MIT Press.

- ❖ Ronald B. Mitchell and Patricia M. Keilbach: Situation Structure and Institutional Design: Reciprocity, Coercion, and Exchange, *International Organization*, Vol. 55, No. 4, The Rational Design of International Institutions ,Autumn, 2001, pp. 891-917, The MIT Press.
- ❖ Rousseau, J.-J.:*Du contrat social*, în *Ouevres completes de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vol. III, ed. Bernard Gagnebin and Marcel Raymond, Paris, Gallimard.
- ❖ Rufus A. Johnstone and Redouan Bshary: Evolution of Spite through Indirect Reciprocity, *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 271, No. 1551 ,Sep. 22, 2004, pp. 1917-1922, The Royal Society.
- ❖ Sandel, M.: *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- ❖ Scanlon, T. M. :*What We Owe to Each Other*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- ❖ Sceffler, Samuel: „, Responsibility, Reactive Attitudes, and Liberalism in philosophy and Politics, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*21: 299-323, 1992.
- ❖ Schmidtz, David: *Elements of Justice*,Cambridge: Cambridge Universitz Press, 2006.
- ❖ Schmitt, C. :*The Concept of the political*, New Brunswick, Rutgers, 1976.
- ❖ Sen, A., and B. Williams :*Utilitarianism and Beyond*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- ❖ S. S. Komorita, J. A. Hilty, C. D. Parks: Reciprocity and Cooperation in Social Dilemmas, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 35, No. 3 ,Sep., 1991, pp. 494-518, Sage Publications, Inc.
- ❖ Takie „Sugiyama Lebra: Reciprocity-Based Moral Sanctions and Messianic Salvation, *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 74, No. 3 ,Jun., 1972, pp. 391-407 ,Blackwell Publishing the American Anthropological.
- ❖ Taylor, C.C.W: *Routledge History of Philosophy*-Volume I- From the Beginning to Plato, Mit Press.
- ❖ Tamir, Y.:*Liberal Nationalism*, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- ❖ Tomasi, John.: *Liberalism Beyond Justice*, Princeton, NJ:Princeton University Press, 2001.
- ❖ Tomlinson, Jack T – Reciprocity: the principle of compensation by adaptation, and an hypothesis on the *function of dreams by San Francisco State College*, 1968.
- ❖ Waldron, Jeremy: „The winsdom of the Multitude: Some Reflections on Book3, Chap.11 of Aristotle’s Politics”,*Political Theory* 23:563-84, 1995.

- ❖ Warnke, G.: *Justice and Interpretation*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1992.
 - ❖ Wittgenstein, Ludwig.: *Philosophical Investigations*, 3rd ed. Anscombe, trans. New York: Mac Millan, 1958.
 - ❖ Wolff, R.P.: *Understanding Rawls*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1979.
 - ❖ Zaitchik, Alan: "On Deserving to Deserve," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 6: 370- 88, 1977.
 - ❖ Zeller, Eduard -: *A History Of Greek Philosophy From The Earliest Period To The Time Of Socrates - Vol I*.
- I. B. Kapferer. *Reciprocitatea*, Philadelphia: Institutul pentru Studiul Chestiunilor Umane.
 - II. Reay, Marie. *Kuma*, Melbourne: Australian National Univ. Press. Rose, A. M. (ed.). 1962.
 - III. Routledge & Kegan Paul: *Comportamentul uman și procesele sociale: o abordare interacționistă*. Londra.
 - IV. Rubel, Paula & Abraham Rosman : *Relevanța modelelor sociale antropologice* (Ass. Social Anthropol. Monogr, Chicago: Univ. Press. Sahlins, Marshall, 1966.
 - V. J. Pouillon & P. Maranda. The Hague: Mouton. Schieffelin, Edward L.: *Spiritul darului, o explicație a textelor* . In *Echanges et communications* (eds) *The sorrow of the lonely and the burning of the dancers*. New York: St Martin's Press. Strathern, Andrew 1971.
 - VI. *The rope of Moka*. Cambridge: Univ. Press. Turner, V. W. 1974. *Dramas, fields and metaphors: symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca, London: Cornell Univ. Press. Wagner, Roy 1969.
 - VII. *The curse of souw*. Chicago: Univ. Press. 1972.

BIBLIOGRAFIE SECUNDARĂ

- ❖ _____ (ed.) *Democracy and Difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1996.
- ❖ _____ a, *Between Facts and Norms*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1995.

- ❖ _____ "Reconciliation through the Public Use of Reason: Remarks on John Rawls' *Political Liberalism*", *Journal of Philosophy*, vol.92, no.3, 1995b.
- ❖ _____, *Einbeziehung des Anderen*, Frankfurt, Suhrkamp, 1996.
- ❖ _____ *What is Enlightenment?* in *Kant: Political Writings*, ed. H. Reiss, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- ❖ _____ *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays*, ed. Ted Humphrey, Cambridge, Hackett Publishing Company, 1795/1983.
- ❖ _____, "Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical", *Philosophy and Public Affairs* vol. 14, 1985.
- ❖ _____, "The Idea of an Overlapping Consensus", *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, vol.7, nr. 1, 1987.
- ❖ _____, "The Priority of Right and Ideas of the Good", *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, vol. 17, 1988.
- ❖ _____, "The Domain of the Political and Overlapping Consensus", *New York University Law Review*, vol. 64, nr. 2, 1989.
- ❖ _____ *Political Liberalism*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1993.
- ❖ The Power of Reciprocity: Fairness, Reciprocity, and Stakes in Variants of the Dictator Game.
- ❖ Punishing Those Responsible for the Prison Abuses at Abu Ghraib: The Influence of the Negative Reciprocity Norm (NRN).
- ❖ A Reexamination Of The Structure And Content Of Confucius' Version Of The Golden Rule
- ❖ Accepting Roles Created for Us: The Ethics of Reciprocity Accountably Other: Trust, Reciprocity and Exclusion in a Context of Situated Practice
- ❖ Alfred Schutz on a Theory of Motivation
- ❖ Autonomy Reconfigured: Incorporating the Role of the Unconscious
- ❖ Beyond Modernity and Tradition: A Third Way for Development1
- ❖ Beyond Reciprocity: Gratitude and Relationships in Everyday Life
- ❖ Can Politics Practice Compassion?
- ❖ Seeing Oneself through the Eyes of the Other: Asymmetrical Reciprocity and Self-respect
- ❖ Central Place Theory and the Reciprocity between Theory and Evidence

- ❖ Challenges to Cultural Diversity: Absolutism, Democracy, and Alain Locke's Value Relativism
- ❖ Introduction: Challenges to Democracy as a Way of Life
- ❖ Competition among Cooperators: Altruism and Reciprocity
- ❖ Competitive Altruism: From Reciprocity to the Handicap Principle
- ❖ Demonstration by Simulation: The Philosophical Significance of Experiment in Helmholtz's Theory of Perception
- ❖ Distributivity Strengthens Reciprocity, Collectivity Weakens It
- ❖ Doing Unto Others: The Reciprocity of Helping Behavior in Organizations
- ❖ Evolution of Cooperation through Indirect Reciprocity
- ❖ Evolution of Spite through Indirect Reciprocity
- ❖ *Freedom, Resentment, and the Psychopath*

Gift Giving and Reciprocity among the Japanese Americans in Honolulu

- ❖ Upstream Reciprocity and the Evolution of Gratitude
- ❖ Gratitude, Reciprocity, and Need
- ❖ 'I Owe You One': Considerations of Role and Reciprocity in a Study of Graduate Education for School Administrators
- ❖ Late Nineteenth Century Lamarckism and French Sociology
- ❖ Literature, Knowledge, and Value
- ❖ The Unique Role of Logic in the Development of Heidegger's Dialogue With Kant.
- ❖ Marx and Human Rights.
- ❖ Reciprocity.
- ❖ Moral Hazard and Reciprocity.
- ❖ 'Mutual Obligation' and 'New Deal': Illegitimate and Unjustified?.
- ❖ On indirect reciprocity: the distinction between reciprocity and altruism, and a comment on suicide terrorism.
- ❖ On Rhetoric as Gift/Giving.
- ❖ Participation as Commodity, Participation as Gift.
- ❖ Reciprocity.
- ❖ Reciprocity: A Possible New Focus For Psychotherapy.
- ❖ Reciprocity among Older Adult Peers.
- ❖ Reciprocity and Cooperation in Social Dilemmas.
- ❖ Reciprocity and Reasonable Disagreement: From Liberal to Democratic Legitimacy.
- ❖ Reciprocity and the Construction of Reality.

- ❖ Reciprocity and voting .
- ❖ Reciprocity.
- ❖ Reciprocity Beyond Dyadic Relationships : Aging-Related Communal Coping..23.
- ❖ Reciprocity in Confucian and Rabbinic Ethics.
- ❖ Reciprocity in International Relations.
- ❖ Reciprocity-Based Moral Sanctions and Messianic Salvation.
- ❖ Relation, Virtue, and Relational Virtue: Three Concepts of Caring.
- ❖ Revealed Altruism.
- ❖ Serial Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement.
- ❖ Situation Structure and Institutional Design: Reciprocity, Coercion, and Exchange.
- ❖ Socialist Modes of Governance and the “Withering Away of the State”: Revisiting Lenin’s *State and Revolution*.
- ❖ Spiritual Relationships as an Analytical Instrument in Psychotherapy With Religious Patients.
- ❖ Reciprocities.
- ❖ Tag-Based Indirect Reciprocity by Incomplete Social Information.
- ❖ The Confucian Notion of Jing (Respect).
- ❖ *The Confucian Relational Concept of the Person and Its Modern Predicament The Faith and Struggle of Beginning (with) Words: On the Turn Between Reconciliation and Recognition.*
- ❖ The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement.
- ❖ The Problem of Unity in the Thought of Martin Buber.
- ❖ The Value of Reciprocity.
- ❖ *Towards a Design-Based Analysis of Emotional Episodes*
- ❖ Transforming the Dilemma.
- ❖ Two Models of Equality and Responsibility.
- ❖ Understanding Delusions of Alien Control.
- ❖ UNESCO Conference on Human Rights and Bioethics.
- ❖ Upstream Reciprocity and the Evolution of Gratitude.
- ❖ Reciprocity.
- ❖ What the Liberal State Should Tolerate Within Its Borders1.
- ❖ What We Deserve, and How We Reciprocate
- ❖ A Theory Of Sequential Reciprocity.
- ❖ A Theory of Justice .

- ❖ Contra Contract: A Brief against John Rawls' "Theory of Justice".
- ❖ A Return to Reciprocity.
- ❖ Seeing Oneself through the Eyes of the Other: Asymmetrical Reciprocity and Self-respect .
- ❖ The Citizen in Question.
- ❖ The Review of Metaphysics.
- ❖ *The Fool's Truth: Diderot, Goethe, and Hegel*
- ❖ Ethical Analysis of Research Partnerships with Communities
- ❖ What We Deserve, and How We Reciprocate..
- ❖ The Desire for the Sovereign and the Logic of Reciprocity in the Family of Nations.
- ❖ Philosophical Review.
- ❖ Constituting Politics: Power, Reciprocity, and Identity.
- ❖ Unconditional welfare benefits and the principle of reciprocity.
- ❖ Rawls on International Justice: A Defense .
- ❖ Rawlsian Social-Contract Theory and the Severely Disabled .
- ❖ Rawls, Kant's Doctrine of Right, and Global Distributive Justice .
- ❖ The Construction of a 'Realistic Utopia': John Rawls and International Political Theory.
- ❖ Reciprocity and Friendship in Beauvoir's Thought.
- ❖ Review: Reciprocity and Virtue Ethics.
- ❖ The Language of Reciprocity in Euripides' Medea.
- ❖ The Reciprocity Argument and the Structure of Plato's *Phaedo*.
- ❖ Book Reviews: Political Theory.

E-BIBLIOGRAFIE