

MEMORANDUM

No 8/99

Justifying Sustainability

By
Geir B. Asheim, Wolfgang Buchholz and Bertil Tungodden

ISSN: 0801-1117

Department of Economics
University of Oslo

This series is published by the
University of Oslo
Department of Economics

P. O.Box 1095 Blindern
N-0317 OSLO Norway
Telephone: + 47 22855127
Fax: + 47 22855035
Internet: <http://www.sv.uio.no/sosoek/>
e-mail: econdep@econ.uio.no

In co-operation with
**The Frisch Centre for Economic
Research**

Gaustadalleén 21
N-0371 OSLO Norway
Telephone: +47 22 95 88 20
Fax: +47 22 95 88 25
Internet: <http://www.frisch.uio.no/>
e-mail: frisch@frisch.uio.no

List of the last 10 Memoranda:

No 26	by Steinar Holden and Karl Ove Moene: Measures to improve Wage Formation in Sweden. 28 p.
No 27	by Frode Johansen and Tor Jakob Klette: Wage and Employment Effects of Payroll Taxes and Investment Subsidies. 27 p.
No 28	by Hilde Bojer: Equivalence Scales and Intra-household Distribution. 12 p.
No 01	By Gabriela Mundaca and Jon Strand: Speculative attacks in the exchange market with a band policy: A sequential game analysis. 45 p.
No 02	By Pedro P.Barros and Tore Nilssen: Industrial Policy and Firm Heterogeneity. 18 p.
No 03	By Steinar Strøm: The Economics of Screening Programs. 8 p.
No 04	By Kai Leitemo and Øistein Røisland: Choosing a Monetary Policy Regime: Effects on the Traded and Non-Traded Sectors
No 05	by Eivind Bjøntegård: The Composite Mean Regression as a Tool in Production Studies. 9 p.
No 06	By Tone Ognedal: Should the Standard of Evidence be reduced for White Collar Crime? 27 p.
No 07	Knut Røed and Tao Zhang: What Hides Behind the Rate of Unemployment? Micro Evidence from Norway. 39 p.

Justifying Sustainability

by

Geir B. Asheim^a

Wolfgang Buchholz^b

Bertil Tungodden^c

9 November 1999

^aUniversity of Oslo, Department of Economics, P.O. Box 1095 Blindern, N-0317 Oslo, Norway, e-mail: g.b.asheim@econ.uio.no (corresponding author)

^bUniversity of Regensburg, Department of Economics, D-93040 Regensburg, Germany, e-mail: wolfgang.buchholz@wiwi.uni-regensburg.de

^cNorwegian School of Economics and Business Administration and the Norwegian Research Centre in Organization and Management, Bergen, Norway, e-mail: bertil.tungodden@nhh.no

Abstract

In the framework of ethical social choice theory, sustainability is justified by Efficiency and Equity as ethical axioms. These axioms correspond to the Suppes-Sen Grading principle. In technologies that are productive in a certain sense, the set of Suppes-Sen maximal utility paths is shown to equal the set of non-decreasing and efficient paths. Since any such path is sustainable, Efficiency and Equity can thus be used to deem any unsustainable path as ethically unacceptable. This finding is contrasted with results that seem to indicate that an infinite number of generations cannot be treated equally.

Key words: Sustainability, Ethical Preferences, Suppes-Sen Grading principle

JEL classification: D63, Q32

1. Introduction

Motivated by a concern about environmental deterioration and natural resource depletion, sustainability is by now one of the key concepts in environmental discussion and, at least partly, in environmental policy. It was a major topic in the Brundtland-report (WCED, 1987) and it has become a main objective of many international organisations like the UN where, after the 1992 United Nations Earth Summit in Rio, it was put on the Agenda 21. Sustainability has also found its firm place as a “leitmotif” in the programs of political parties and green political movements. The increasing importance of sustainability as a guideline of environmental policy is also reflected in environmental and resource economics; see e.g. Pezzey (1997) where sustainable paths are confronted with standard optimal solutions as described in the traditional theory of economic growth.

An ethical concern is at the heart of the interest in a sustainable environmental policy (cf. Toman, Pezzey and Krautkraemer (1995, pp. 140-142) and Sandler (1997, p. 64)). In particular, sustainability implies that environmental and natural resources have to be shared with future generations. These resources are seen as a common heritage of mankind to which every generation should have the same right of access. Following Sidgwick (1907, p. 414), Pigou (1952, p. 25) and Ramsey (1928, p. 543) there is also a long tradition in economics for considering the unfavourable treatment of future generations as ethically unacceptable. Not much work has, however, been done on the relationship between an ethical postulate of equal treatment of all generations on the one hand and sustainability on the other. The present paper seeks to provide such a contribution by giving a justification for sustainability in the framework of ethical social choice theory.¹ Our main result is that within a relevant class of technologies only sustainable behaviour is ethically justifiable provided that the social preferences satisfy two focal normative axioms; equal treatment being one, efficiency being the other.

There is a technical literature on intergenerational social preferences that contains rather negative results concerning the possibility of treating generations equally. This literature includes Koopmans (1960), Diamond (1965), Svensson (1980), Epstein (1986, 1987), Lauwers (1997), and it essentially presents the finding that complete social preferences that treat an *infinite* number of generations equally need not admit optimal solutions. This negative conclusion appears not to have been much noticed by environmental and resource economists, Dasgupta

¹ Most of the extensive social choice literature on the evaluation of infinite utility paths does not deal with the issue of sustainability. Exceptions are Asheim (1991) and the prominent contributions by Chichilnisky (1996, 1997), as well as an informal treatment by Buchholz (1997) who suggested the idea that the present paper develops.

and Heal (1979, pp. 277–281) being a remarkable exception. Still, it represents a challenge to everyone concerned with sustainability: *Is the quest for the equal treatment of an infinite number of generations (implicitly) assumed in the recent literature on sustainability a vain one since earlier technical contributions have shown that such equal treatment need not be possible?* This paper resolves this apparent conflict by looking directly at the possibility of having intergenerational preferences that are *effective* (in the sense of having a non-empty set of maximal paths) in a *relevant class* of technologies.²

The paper is organised as follows: After describing the proposed axiomatic basis for intergenerational ethical preferences in Section 2, we introduce the technological framework of the analysis and define the concept of sustainability in Section 3. Throughout the paper we apply two different productivity assumptions, **Immediate productivity** and **Eventual productivity**, and we show that both assumptions apply in many important classes of technologies. In Section 4 we develop a justification for sustainability by showing that an axiom of equal treatment (**Equity**) combined with the strong Pareto axiom (**Efficiency**) will be sufficient to rule out non-sustainable intergenerational utility paths as maximal paths and thus as optimal solutions for any social preferences satisfying these axioms, as long as **Immediate productivity** holds. This result depends only on the assumption that the utility of any generation is (at least) ordinally measurable and level comparable to the utility levels of other generations. In this respect it strengthens earlier results (cf. Asheim (1991)), where the more demanding assumption of full cardinal unit comparability had to be assumed.

Finally, we show that social preferences satisfying **Efficiency** and **Equity** are effective (i.e., yield a non-empty set of maximal paths) under the provision that the technology satisfies **Eventual productivity**. As demonstrated in Section 5, **Eventual productivity** is even sufficient to ensure the existence of *complete* social preferences obeying both **Efficiency** and **Equity** and resulting in a unique and sustainable solution to the problem of intergenerational justice. Thus, this paper yields results in a positive spirit as compared to much of the literature on intergenerational social preferences: An infinite number of generations can be treated equally, and such treatment justifies sustainability.

² The concern for effectiveness was emphasized by Koopmans (1960, Postulate 5) and Epstein (1986; 1987, p. 723), while the importance of limiting attention to a particular class of technologies was illustrated by e.g. Asheim (1991). A problem with the social choice approach to sustainability suggested by Chichilnisky (1996, 1997) is that it is not effective even in relevant technologies (provided that the term in her maximand reflecting the sustainable utility level is not made redundant by a decreasing discount rate). For a specific discussion of this problem, see Asheim (1996); for a general investigation into the applicability of Chichilnisky's criterion, see Heal (1998).

2. Ethical Preferences

In deriving criteria for intergenerational distributive justice we adopt a purely consequentialistic approach which completely abstains from judging e.g. the intentions and procedures lying behind each generation's actions. Then the problem of giving an ethical basis for sustainability is reduced to making comparisons between feasible intergenerational distributions. There are many possible ways of solving conflicts of interests between generations in this framework. Here we will look for „a political conception of justice that we hope can gain the support of an overlapping consensus of reasonable ... doctrines”, “a political conception the principles and values of which all citizens can endorse“ (Rawls (1993, p. 10)).

Formally, there is an infinite number of generations $t = 1, 2, \dots$. The utility level of generation t is given by u_t , which should be interpreted as the utility level of a representative member of this generation. Thus we do not discuss the issue of *intragenerational* distribution. We assume that u_t measures the instantaneous well-being that generation t derives from its current situation. The term ‘instantaneous well-being’ signifies that u_t does not include altruism or envy towards other generations. We take instantaneous well-being as a starting point, because we consider it important to separate the definition and analysis of sustainability from the forces (e.g. altruism towards future generations) that can motivate generations to act in accordance with the requirement of sustainability; see also Rawls (1971, § 22). Moreover, we assume that the utilities need not be more than ordinally measurable and level comparable.³ Hence, it is sufficient to require that the utility levels of each generation can be ranked on an ordinal scale and that these levels can be compared between generations.

In order to compare different intergenerational utility paths, some binary relation R over paths ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ starting in period 1 is needed. Any such binary relation R is throughout assumed to be reflexive and transitive,⁴ but R may be complete or incomplete. If ${}_1\mathbf{v} R {}_1\mathbf{u}$ and ${}_1\mathbf{u} R {}_1\mathbf{v}$ hold simultaneously, then there is indifference between ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ and ${}_1\mathbf{u}$, which is denoted by ${}_1\mathbf{v} I {}_1\mathbf{u}$. If, however, ${}_1\mathbf{v} R {}_1\mathbf{u}$ but *not* ${}_1\mathbf{u} R {}_1\mathbf{v}$ obtains, then there is (strict) preference for ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ over ${}_1\mathbf{u}$, which is, as usual, denoted by ${}_1\mathbf{v} P {}_1\mathbf{u}$. Thus I gives the symmetric and P the asymmetric part of the social preferences R .

In this paper the social preferences R will be used to determine solutions that are *ethically acceptable*. Such an approach might be questioned (cf. Pezzey (1997, pp. 450-460) since any

³ Sen (1970) is the basic reference on measurability and comparability assumptions in social choice theory. See Blackorby, Donaldson and Weymark (1984) for an instructive survey.

⁴ *Reflexivity* means that ${}_1\mathbf{u} R {}_1\mathbf{u}$ for any ${}_1\mathbf{u}$. *Transitivity* means that ${}_1\mathbf{u} R {}_1\mathbf{v}$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v} R {}_1\mathbf{w}$.

norm stems from subjective value judgements that cannot be scientifically substantiated. Nevertheless, there may exist some basic norms whose ethical appeal seems rather uncontroversial and which can thus be used as axioms for characterising ethical preferences. Anyone disagreeing with the conclusions that can be drawn from these ethical preferences will then have to argue against the basic norms. Such an axiomatic method makes an ethical debate about normative prescription more transparent by reducing it to an evaluation of the underlying axioms.

The least controversial ethical axiom on R is that any social preferences must deem one utility path superior to another if at least one generation is better off and no generation is worse off.

Efficiency (of R): If ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$ are two utility paths with $v_t \geq u_t$ for all t and $v_s > u_s$ for some s , then ${}_1\mathbf{v} P {}_1\mathbf{u}$.

We call this axiom **Efficiency** as it implies that any maximal path is efficient. It is also called *Strong Pareto* or *Strong Sensitivity*. The axiom ensures that the social preferences are sensitive to utility increases of any one generation.

The other basic ethical axiom on R imposes equal treatment of all generations by requiring that any social preferences must leave the social valuation of a utility path unchanged when the utility levels of any two generations along the path are permuted.

Equity (of R): If ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$ are two utility paths with $u_{s'} = v_{s''}$ and $u_{s''} = v_{s'}$ for some s', s'' and $u_t = v_t$ for all $t \neq s', s''$, then ${}_1\mathbf{v} I {}_1\mathbf{u}$.

The **Equity** axiom is sometimes also called *Weak Anonymity* or *Intergenerational Neutrality*. It can be considered a basic fairness norm as it ensures that everyone counts the same in social evaluation.⁵ In the intergenerational context the **Equity** axiom implies that it is not justifiable to discriminate against some generation only because it appears at a later stage on the time axis. At least in a world of certainty (as we assume here) **Equity** seems to fall within the category of principles that any reasonable normative doctrine for intergenerational justice should endorse.

Note that both **Efficiency** and **Equity** are compatible with u_t being only an ordinal measure that is level comparable to the utility level of any other generation. This in turn means that these

⁵ Invoking impartiality in this way is the cornerstone of ethical social choice theory reaching far beyond intergenerational comparisons (see e.g. Sen (1970, Ch. 5), Hammond (1976), d'Aspremont and Gevers (1977), Roemer (1996, p. 32), and Mongin and d'Aspremont (1996)). In a setting with an infinite number of time periods, the **Equity** axiom was first introduced by Diamond (1965). Later it has been used in many contributions to formalise distributional concerns between an infinite number of generations (see e.g. Svensson (1980), who associates the term *ethical preferences* with the **Efficiency** and **Equity** axioms).

ethical axioms do *not* entail that a certain *decrease* of utility for one generation will be compensated by the same *increase* of utility for another generation since *changes* in utility need not be comparable. In other words, **Equity** does not imply undiscounted utilitarianism.

Obviously, the **Efficiency** and **Equity** axioms are not sufficient to determine a complete binary relation. It is of interest to consider the incomplete binary relation R^* that is generated by **Efficiency** and **Equity**, i.e. which is obtained when only these two axioms are assumed. Formally, we seek a reflexive and transitive binary relation R^* that satisfies **Efficiency** and **Equity** and has the property of being a subrelation⁶ to any reflexive and transitive binary relation R satisfying **Efficiency** and **Equity**. It turns out that such a binary relation R^* exists and coincides with the well-known *Suppes-Sen Grading principle* R_S (cf. Suppes (1966), Sen (1970) and e.g. Madden (1996), and in the intergenerational context Svensson (1980)). The binary relation R_S deems two paths to be indifferent if the one is obtained from the other through a finite permutation, where a permutation $\pi(\cdot)$, i.e. a bijective mapping of $\{1,2,\dots\}$ onto itself, is called *finite* whenever there is a T such that $\pi(t) = t$ for any $t \geq T$.

Definition 1: For any two utility paths ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$, the relation ${}_1\mathbf{v} R_S {}_1\mathbf{u}$ holds if there is a finite permutation $\pi(\cdot)$ of $\{1,2,\dots\}$ which has $v_{\pi(t)} \geq u_t$ for all t .

Let P_S denote the asymmetric part of R_S . Say that ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ *Suppes-Sen dominates* ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ if ${}_1\mathbf{v} P_S {}_1\mathbf{u}$. By Definition 1, a utility path Suppes-Sen dominates an alternative path if a finite permutation of the former Pareto-dominates the latter. The following proposition states that the Suppes-Sen relation is indeed generated by **Efficiency** and **Equity**:

Proposition 1: R_S satisfies **Efficiency** and **Equity** and R_S is a subrelation to any reflexive and transitive binary relation R satisfying **Efficiency** and **Equity**.

Thus, in the intergenerational context the Suppes-Sen Grading principle can be given an ethical foundation in terms of two focal normative postulates for social preferences. The proof (which is straightforward and hence deleted) is based on the observation that if a reflexive and transitive binary relation satisfies **Equity**, then two utility paths are indifferent if the one is obtained from the other by moving around the utility levels of a *finite* number of generations.⁷

⁶ R^* is said to be a *subrelation* to R if ${}_1\mathbf{v} R^* {}_1\mathbf{u}$ implies ${}_1\mathbf{v} R {}_1\mathbf{u}$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v} P^* {}_1\mathbf{u}$ implies ${}_1\mathbf{v} P {}_1\mathbf{u}$, with P^* denoting the asymmetric part of R^* .

⁷ Van Liedekerke and Lauwers (1997) argue that moving around only a *finite* number of utility levels is *not* sufficient to ensure the impartial treatment of an *infinite* number of generations. But if **Equity** is strengthened to allow for the permutation of the utility levels of an *infinite* number of generations, then a reflexive and transitive

In Section 4, we will justify sustainability by the use of the Suppes-Sen Grading principle. Since this justification is concerned with non-decreasing paths, the following characterization of the Suppes-Sen Grading principle turns out to be useful, where, for any path ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ and any time T , ${}_1\mathbf{u}_T = (u_1, \dots, u_T)$ denotes the truncation of ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ at T and ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$ denotes a permutation of ${}_1\mathbf{u}_T$ having the property that ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$ is non-decreasing.⁸

Proposition 2: For any two paths ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$ the relation ${}_1\mathbf{v} R_S {}_1\mathbf{u}$ holds if and only if there is a time T such that

- (i) ${}_{T+1}\mathbf{v}$ Pareto-dominates or is identical to ${}_{T+1}\mathbf{u}$
- (ii) ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T$ Pareto-dominates or is identical to ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$.

Proof: (If) Obvious. (Only if) If ${}_1\mathbf{v} R_S {}_1\mathbf{u}$, there is a time T at least as large as any period that is affected by the finite permutation of Definition 1. Then ${}_{T+1}\mathbf{v}$ Pareto-dominates or is identical to ${}_{T+1}\mathbf{u}$, i.e. (i) holds, and a permutation of ${}_1\mathbf{v}_T$ Pareto-dominates or is identical to ${}_1\mathbf{u}_T$. Suppose ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T$ neither Pareto-dominates nor is identical to ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$; i.e., there is a period $s \leq T$ with $\tilde{v}_s < \tilde{u}_s$. Consider a finite permutation π of $\{1, \dots, T\}$ with $\tilde{v}_{\pi(t)} \geq \tilde{u}_t$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, which exists by construction since a permutation of ${}_1\mathbf{v}_T$ Pareto-dominates or is identical to ${}_1\mathbf{u}_T$, and hence, a permutation of ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T$ Pareto-dominates or is identical to ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$. There can be no $s' > s$ with $\pi(s') \leq s$ as, ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$ and ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T$ being non-decreasing, this would imply $\tilde{v}_{\pi(s')} \leq \tilde{v}_s < \tilde{u}_s \leq \tilde{u}_{s'}$, which contradicts that $\tilde{v}_{\pi(t)} \geq \tilde{u}_t$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$. Thus $\pi(\cdot)$ is even a permutation of the subset of periods $\{1, \dots, s\}$. For all periods within this set, however, no \tilde{v}_t exceeds \tilde{v}_s , as $\tilde{v}_s = \max\{\tilde{v}_t : t \leq s\}$, which contradicts that $\tilde{v}_{\pi(s)} \geq \tilde{u}_s$. Hence, if a permutation of ${}_1\mathbf{v}_T$ Pareto-dominates or is identical to ${}_1\mathbf{u}_T$, there is no period s with $\tilde{v}_s < \tilde{u}_s$. QED.

Proposition 2 deals with the Suppes-Sen Grading principle in a general setting. However, to establish a link to the concept of sustainability, we will have to consider the implications of this principle within a relevant class of technologies. This amounts to defining a *domain restriction* for R_S , and we now turn to this issue.

binary relation cannot simultaneously satisfy **Efficiency**. See Vallentyne (1995) for a defence of the finite version of **Equity**.

⁸ Saposnik (1983) proves a similar result for the finite number case.

3. Sustainable Paths and Productive Technologies

In order to define sets of feasible paths we assume that the initial endowment of generation $t \geq 1$ is given by a n -dimensional ($n < \infty$) vector of capital stocks k_t which may include different forms of man-made capital as well as different types of natural and environmental resource stocks. A generation t acts by choosing a utility level u_t and a vector of capital stocks k_{t+1} which is bequeathed to the next generation $t+1$. For every t the function F_t gives the maximum utility attainable for generation t if k_t is inherited and k_{t+1} is bequeathed, i.e. $u_t \leq F_t(k_t, k_{t+1})$ has to hold for any feasible *utility-bequest pair* (u_t, k_{t+1}) of generation t . Furthermore, it is assumed that the utility level of each generation cannot fall below a certain lower bound \underline{u} . This lower bound serves two purposes. First, \underline{u} can be interpreted as the subsistence level of any generation. Moreover, since there are technological limitations on the accumulation of stocks in the course of one period, $F_t(k_t, k_{t+1}) < \underline{u}$ can be used to capture that the bequest k_{t+1} is infeasible given the inheritance k_t . Hence, generation t 's utility-bequest pair (u_t, k_{t+1}) is said to be *feasible* at t given k_t if $\underline{u} \leq u_t \leq F_t(k_t, k_{t+1})$. Assuming ordinal level comparability, nothing is changed if \underline{u} , u and F are transformed by the same strictly increasing function ϕ so that the feasibility constraint reads as $\phi(\underline{u}) \leq \phi(u_t) \leq \phi(F_t(k_t, k_{t+1}))$.

The sequence ${}_1\mathbf{F} = (F_1, F_2, \dots)$ characterises the *technology* of the economy under consideration. Given the technology ${}_1\mathbf{F} = (F_1, F_2, \dots)$, a utility path ${}_t\mathbf{u} = (u_t, u_{t+1}, \dots)$ is *feasible* at t given k_t if there exists a path ${}_{t+1}\mathbf{k} = (k_{t+1}, k_{t+2}, \dots)$ such that, for all $s \geq t$, generation s 's utility-bequest pair (u_s, k_{s+1}) is feasible at s given k_s . If ${}_t\mathbf{u} = (u_t, u_{t+1}, \dots)$ is feasible at t given k_t , then the same holds true for any other path ${}_t\mathbf{v} = (v_t, v_{t+1}, \dots)$ with $\underline{u} \leq v_s \leq u_s$ for each $s \geq t$ since $\underline{u} \leq v_s \leq u_s \leq F_s(k_s, k_{s+1})$ implies that (v_s, k_{s+1}) is feasible at s given k_s .

Before providing an ethical justification for sustainability in this technological framework we need to clarify what this concept means. As noted by Krautkraemer (1998, p. 2091), “[w]hile there is an abundance of definitions of sustainability, it basically gets at the issue of whether or not future generations will be at least as well off as the present generation.” Our definition is in line with this view:

Definition 2: Generation t with inheritance k_t is said to *behave in a sustainable manner* if it chooses a feasible utility-bequest pair (u_t, k_{t+1}) so that the constant utility path (u_t, u_t, \dots) is feasible at $t+1$ given k_{t+1} . The utility path ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ is called *sustainable* given k_1 if there exists ${}_2\mathbf{k} = (k_2, k_3, \dots)$ such that every generation behaves in a sustainable manner along $({}_1\mathbf{k}, {}_1\mathbf{u}) = (k_1, (u_1, k_2), (u_2, k_3), \dots)$.

This definition corresponds closely to what is usually meant by sustainability. E.g. it can be shown that any path sustainable according to Definition 2 is also sustainable according to a definition of sustainability proposed by Pezzey (1997).⁹ Furthermore, Definition 1 satisfies a characterisation of sustainability suggested by Asheim and Brekke (1997).¹⁰

Definition 2 does *not* entail that it will be desirable to follow *any* sustainable path. In particular, a generation may leave behind a wrong *mix* of capital stocks, leading to the realisation of an inefficient path. Such inefficiency may be the result of a sequence of generations performing piece-wise planning rather than an omnipotent and benevolent social planner implementing an overall plan. However, even though it will not be desirable to follow *any* sustainable path, it might be the case that any “good” path is sustainable. Such a justification for sustainability is offered in the following section. For this purpose, we make use of a condition which is sufficient for sustainability of utility paths.¹¹

Proposition 3: If ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ is a non-decreasing utility path that is feasible given k_1 , then ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is sustainable.

Proof: By feasibility there exists ${}_1\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2, \dots)$ so that $\underline{u} \leq u_t \leq F_t(k_t, k_{t+1})$ for all $t \geq 1$. Hence, for all t , ${}_{t+1}\mathbf{u} = (u_{t+1}, u_{t+2}, \dots)$ is feasible at $t+1$ given k_{t+1} . If ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ is non-decreasing, then $u_t \leq u_{t+1}$, $u_t \leq u_{t+2}$, ... , and it follows that (u_t, u_t, \dots) if feasible at $t+1$ given k_{t+1} , implying that any generation t behaves in a sustainable manner by choosing (u_t, k_{t+1}) . Thus ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ is sustainable. QED.

The converse of Proposition 3 does not hold, i.e. it is not the case that only non-decreasing utility paths are sustainable. In particular, it is not in conflict with sustainability that generation t makes a large sacrifice to the benefit of future generations, leading to its own utility being lower than that of generation $t-1$.

To give a justification for sustainability we will show that, whenever utility paths are ethically justified according to **Efficiency** and **Equity**, they fulfil the sufficient condition for sustainability provided by Proposition 3; i.e. they are non-decreasing. This is not possible without imposing a

⁹ His definition is: The path ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ is sustainable given k_1 if there exists ${}_2\mathbf{k} = (k_2, k_3, \dots)$ such that, for all $t \geq 1$, there exists a constant path $(\bar{u}_t, \bar{u}_t, \dots)$ with $\bar{u}_t \geq u_t$ that is feasible at t given k_t .

¹⁰ Their characterization is: Generation t behaves in a sustainable manner given k_t by choosing a feasible pair (u_t, k_{t+1}) if and only if it is possible for generation $t+1$ to choose (u_{t+1}, k_{t+2}) with $u_{t+1} \geq u_t$ even if generation $t+1$ behaves in a sustainable manner given k_{t+1} .

¹¹ Pezzey (1997, p. 451) refers to a non-decreasing utility path as sustained development. See Pezzey (1997, pp. 451-452) for a discussion of the distinction between sustainability and sustainedness.

restriction on the technology which, however, is not very demanding. In an intertemporal context one usually considers technologies that exhibit some kind of productivity. Such productivity can be based on the assumption that consumption can be costlessly postponed to later periods by transforming consumption sacrifices into stocks of man-made capital or by not depleting natural capital. This means that it will be possible to switch consumption between two periods when originally there is higher consumption in the earlier period. This is the starting point of our assumption of **Immediate productivity**, where productivity for a certain technology is defined, not in terms of consumption, but directly in terms of utility.

Immediate productivity (of ${}_1\mathbf{F}$): If ${}_t\mathbf{u} = (u_t, u_{t+1}, \dots)$ is feasible at t given k_t with $u_t > u_{t+1}$, then $(u_{t+1}, u_t, u_{t+2}, \dots)$ is feasible and inefficient at t given k_t .

By the postulated inefficiency of the permuted utility path, there is even a utility gain when the excess utility enjoyed by generation t in comparison to generation $t+1$ is deferred one period. But even if **Immediate productivity** holds efficient sustainable paths need not exist. To ensure existence of such paths we make another assumption, which is fulfilled for technologies usually considered in the context of sustainability.

Eventual productivity (of ${}_1\mathbf{F}$): For any t and k_t , there exists a feasible and efficient path with constant utility.

Hence, if ${}_1\mathbf{F}$ satisfies **Eventual productivity**, there is, for any t and k_t , a utility level $m_t(k_t)$ such that the path $(m_t(k_t), m_t(k_t), \dots)$ is feasible and efficient at t given k_t . Thus, the utility level $m_t(k_t)$ is the *maximum sustainable utility* that can be attained if capital k_t is inherited in period t . Note that the assumptions of **Immediate productivity** and **Eventual productivity** are both invariant w.r.t. the same positive transformation of each F_t for $t = 1, 2, \dots$, i.e. they are also compatible with u_t being only an ordinal measure that is level comparable to the utility level of any other generation.

The following examples show that the general framework described above includes many important classes of technologies as special cases. As a first example, which also shows the logical independence of **Immediate productivity** and **Eventual productivity**, consider the class of linear technologies, which have been used by e.g. Epstein (1986).

Example 1: A linear technology is defined by an exogenously given positive price path ${}_1\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots)$. A consumption path ${}_t\mathbf{c} = (c_t, c_{t+1}, \dots)$ is feasible at t given k_t if and only if

$\sum_{s=t}^{\infty} p_s c_s \leq p_t k_t$ which is the intertemporal analogue of the standard budget constraint of a household. This explains the interpretation of p_t as the “price” of consumption in period t . In the corresponding linear growth model the ratio p_t/p_{t+1} is the *gross* rate of return $1+r_t$ on the part of the one-dimensional and non-negative inheritance k_t that is not consumed at time t :

$$0 \leq k_{t+1} \leq \frac{p_t}{p_{t+1}}(k_t - c_t), \quad c_t \geq 0.$$

If utility of consumption c_t is described by a strictly increasing utility function u , a linear technology falls into the framework above, with $\underline{u} = u(0)$ and $F_t(k_t, k_{t+1}) = u(c_t) = u(k_t - p_{t+1}k_{t+1}/p_t)$.

A linear technology satisfies **Immediate productivity** if and only if the exogenously given positive price path ${}_1\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots)$ is strictly decreasing; i.e., if $p_t > p_{t+1}$ for all $t \geq 1$, entailing that $r_t = p_t/p_{t+1} - 1$, the *net* rate of return on the part of the inheritance k_t that is not consumed at time t , is positive. **Eventual productivity** (with $m_t(k_t) = u(p_t k_t / \sum_{s=t}^{\infty} p_s)$) is satisfied for a linear technology if and only if $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} p_s < \infty$. As this assumption is compatible with $p_t < p_{t+1}$ for some time t , this example also shows that **Eventual productivity** does not imply **Immediate productivity**. Conversely, as a strictly decreasing price path ${}_1\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots)$ with $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} p_s = \infty$ exists (e.g. when $p_t = 1/t$ for any t), **Immediate productivity** does not imply **Eventual productivity**.

Example 2: A second example is given by the *one-sector model* where f is a strictly increasing and concave production function, depending solely on the non-negative stock of man-made capital k_t which is physically identical to the consumption good. Here,

$$c_t + k_{t+1} \leq f(k_t) + k_t, \quad c_t \geq 0, \quad k_{t+1} \geq 0,$$

implying that $\underline{u} = u(0)$ and $F(k_t, k_{t+1}) = u(f(k_t) + k_t - k_{t+1})$, where u is again a strictly increasing utility function as above. Since the technology is not time-dependent, the functional value of F depends only on inheritance and bequest. The one-sector model satisfies **Immediate productivity** since f is strictly increasing in k_t . It satisfies **Eventual productivity** with $m_t(k_t) = u(f(k_t))$ since the constant utility path ${}_t\mathbf{u} = (m_t(k_t), m_t(k_t), \dots)$ is feasible at t given k_t , while increasing utility in period t to a level $u_t > m_t(k_t)$ but still having $u_s = m_t(k_t)$ in the subsequent periods $s > t$ will eventually tear the capital stock down to zero.

Example 3: The third example is a discrete-time version of the *Dasgupta-Heal-Solow-model* (cf. Dasgupta and Heal (1974) and Solow (1974)), where production also depends on the extraction of an exhaustible natural resource. Here, $k_t = (k_t^m, k_t^n)$, where k_t^m is the non-negative stock of

manmade capital, and where k_t^n is the non-negative stock of the natural resource available in period t . By letting, in this example, f denote a production function depending on the input k_t^m of man-made capital and the non-negative extraction rate of the natural resource $k_t^n - k_{t+1}^n$, we get that $c_t + k_{t+1}^m \leq f(k_t^m, k_t^n - k_{t+1}^n) + k_t^m$. Hence, $\underline{u} = u(0)$ and $F(k_t, k_{t+1}) = u(f(k_t^m, k_t^n - k_{t+1}^n) + k_t^m - k_{t+1}^m)$ for any strictly increasing utility function u as above.

The Dasgupta-Heal-Solow model satisfies **Immediate productivity** if the production function f is strictly increasing in its first variable. In this model, Cass and Mitra (1991) give a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a path with constant and positive consumption given an initial vector of positive stocks. In the Cobb-Douglas case where $f(k_t^m, k_t^n - k_{t+1}^n) = (k_t^m)^\alpha (k_t^n - k_{t+1}^n)^\beta$ holds, this condition is $\alpha > \beta$, i.e. the elasticity of production of man-made capital has to exceed the elasticity of production of the natural resource input. Dasgupta and Mitra (1983) show that this implies the existence of an *efficient* path with constant consumption so that **Eventual productivity** holds.

There may also be examples where utility at time t is directly dependent on stocks of natural resources available at t . **Immediate productivity** can well be obtained in such an economy if it is based on investing man-made capital and if there is no autonomous depreciation of the stocks of natural capital. An efficient constant utility path which is required for **Eventual productivity** could be given either by substituting man-made goods for the utility value provided by the stocks of natural capital or, if such a substitution is not possible, by leaving the amounts of the natural resource stocks invariant. The technological framework used in this paper also captures this situation, which is the perspective of proponents for strong sustainability.

4. A Justification for Sustainability

Given any technology ${}_1\mathbf{F}$ and any binary relation R , say that

- the feasible utility path ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is R -maximal given k_1 , if there exists no feasible path ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ given k_1 such that ${}_1\mathbf{v} P {}_1\mathbf{u}$.
- R is *effective* in ${}_1\mathbf{F}$ if, for any k_1 , there exists an R -maximal path given k_1 .
- a R -maximal path ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is *time-consistent* if, for any corresponding path of capital stock vectors ${}_1\mathbf{k}$ and for all $t > 1$, ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ is R -maximal given \tilde{k}_1 in ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$ where $\tilde{k}_1 = k_t$ and for all $s \geq 1$, $\tilde{u}_s = u_{s+t-1}$ and $\tilde{F}_s = F_{s+t-1}$.

We will establish that when social preferences R satisfying **Efficiency** and **Equity** are applied to technologies fulfilling the assumption of **Immediate productivity**, then any R -maximal is non-decreasing and thus sustainable. To provide such a justification for sustainability we will first determine the set of utility paths that are maximal w.r.t. Suppes-Sen Grading principle R_S . The question of effectiveness will be treated in Proposition 6.

*Proposition 4: If the technology satisfies **Immediate productivity**, then the set of R_S -maximal utility paths is equal to the set of efficient and non-decreasing paths, and every R_S -maximal utility path is time-consistent.*

Proof:

- (i) Every R_S -maximal path is efficient and non-decreasing: Efficiency is obvious by the definition of R_S . Suppose that there is a R_S -maximal path ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ given k_1 in period 1 which is *not* non-decreasing. Then there is a period t where $u_t > u_{t+1}$. If k_t is the capital vector in period t , then, by **Immediate Productivity**, $(u_{t+1}, u_t, u_{t+2}, \dots)$ is feasible at t given k_t , and it is Pareto-dominated by another path ${}_t\mathbf{v} = (v_t, v_{t+1}, \dots)$ that is feasible at t given k_t . This means that the utility path $(u_1, u_2, \dots, v_t, v_{t+1}, \dots)$ is feasible given k_1 and Suppes-Sen dominates ${}_1\mathbf{u}$, contradicting that ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is R_S -maximal. Hence, ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is non-decreasing.
- (ii) Every efficient and non-decreasing path is R_S -maximal: Suppose that a non-decreasing path ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ is efficient given k_1 , and that a path ${}_1\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$ is feasible given k_1 and Suppes-Sen dominates ${}_1\mathbf{u}$. Since by Suppes-Sen dominance there is a finite permutation of ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ that Pareto-dominates ${}_1\mathbf{u}$, there exists a T such that ${}_{T+1}\mathbf{v}$ Pareto-dominates or is identical to ${}_{T+1}\mathbf{u}$. Let ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T$ be a permutation of ${}_1\mathbf{v}_T$ having the property that ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T$ is non-decreasing. By **Immediate productivity** the path $({}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T, {}_{T+1}\mathbf{v})$ is feasible given k_1 , as by a sequence of pairwise permutations it is possible to start a feasible utility path in period 1 with the minimum utility level of ${}_1\mathbf{v}_T$, and so on. By Proposition 2 and the premises that ${}_1\mathbf{u}_T$ is non-decreasing and ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ Suppes-Sen dominates ${}_1\mathbf{u}$, it follows that $({}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T, {}_{T+1}\mathbf{v})$ Pareto-dominates ${}_1\mathbf{u}$, which contradicts the efficiency of ${}_1\mathbf{u}$. Hence, ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is R_S -maximal.
- (iii) Every R_S -maximal utility path ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ with a corresponding path ${}_1\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2, \dots)$ of capital stock vectors is non-decreasing and efficient by (i). Then for any time period t ${}_t\mathbf{u} = (u_t, u_{t+1}, \dots)$ is non-decreasing and efficient at t given k_t so that it is R_S -maximal by (ii) if R_S is applied to the set of all utility paths feasible at t given k_t . This shows time-consistency. QED.

Combining this result with Propositions 1 and 3 gives an ethical justification for sustainable paths. This is the central result of the paper.

*Proposition 5: If the reflexive and transitive social preferences R satisfy **Efficiency** and **Equity** and the technology satisfies **Immediate Productivity**, then only sustainable utility paths are R -maximal.*

Proof: If R is a reflexive and transitive binary relation satisfying **Efficiency** and **Equity**, then it follows from Proposition 1 that every R -maximal element is R_s -maximal and thus by Proposition 4 that it is non-decreasing. By Proposition 3, however, any such path is sustainable. QED.




Figure 1

Proposition 5, which can be illustrated by Figure 1, means that every unsustainable utility path is unacceptable within any reasonable theory of justice as long as a weak productivity assumption is satisfied. In this respect, notice that we have worked with a very broad definition of a reasonable theory of justice. We have accepted

- incompleteness of the social preferences,
- any informational framework as long as utility is (at least) ordinally measurable and level comparable,
- any consequentialistic theory of distributive justice that satisfies **Efficiency** and **Equity**, which are requirements that many will consider to be indisputable.

Our results resemble those obtained in an earlier work of Asheim (1991) where, however, the equality of intergenerational distributions of utility measured in the Lorenz sense provides the

basis for social preferences, thereby requiring a cardinal measure of utility that is both unit and level comparable. It is an important feature of Proposition 5 that it makes the assumption of cardinal unit comparability dispensable. But if cardinal unit comparability of the utility of different generations is assumed and, in addition, utilitarianism with zero intergenerational discounting—generalized to an infinite number of generations by means of the overtaking criterion¹²—is adopted, then we obtain a special case of social preferences satisfying the **Efficiency** and **Equity** axioms. This in turn means that Propositions 1 and 4 give a generalisation of the observation made by Dasgupta and Heal (1979, pp. 303-308) and Hamilton (1995, p. 407), namely that in the Dasgupta-Heal-Solow model the undiscounted utilitarian maximum will nowhere show decreasing utility.

Propositions 4 and 5 do not address the question of *effectiveness* of R_S , i.e. the existence of R_S -maximal paths. Even if the technology satisfies **Immediate productivity**, utility paths which are both non-decreasing and efficient need not exist so that the set of R_S -maximal paths may well be empty. This is indeed the case in the linear technology of Section 3 (Example 1) when the price path is strictly decreasing, but where the sum of the prices diverges. The following proposition, however, shows that effectiveness of R_S can be established by assuming **Eventual Productivity**.

*Proposition 6: If the technology satisfies **Eventual productivity**, then the Suppes-Sen Grading principle R_S is effective. Furthermore, for any k_1 there is a R_S -maximal path that is time-consistent and sustainable.*¹³

Proof: If the technology satisfies **Eventual productivity**, then, for any given k_1 , there exists a feasible and efficient path ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (m_1(k_1), m_1(k_1), \dots)$ with constant utility. Since ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ has constant utility, the existence of an alternative feasible path ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ Suppes-Sen dominating ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ would contradict the efficiency of ${}_1\mathbf{u}$. Hence, ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is R_S -maximal given k_1 . This path is time-consistent, and by Proposition 3, it is also sustainable. QED.

Thus it is seen that in a relevant class of technologies, the **Equity** axiom is useful for intergenerational social evaluation, even in the case of an infinite number of generations. This conclusion is somewhat different from the message conveyed by the literature.

¹² See Weizsäcker (1965) and, for a more recent discussion in the philosophical literature, Vallentyne (1993) and Vallentyne and Kagan (1997).

¹³ Note that within a technology satisfying **Eventual Productivity** only, the Suppes-Sen Grading principle is not sufficient to rule out unsustainable utility paths.

5. On the Possibility of Treating an Infinite Number of Generations Equally

In most of the literature since Koopmans (1960) the view prevails that **Equity** might be difficult to apply in the intergenerational context if there is an *infinite* number of generations. So, e.g., Diamond (1965, p. 170) purports to show “the impossibility of treating all time periods the same”, and for Dasgupta and Heal (1979, p. 280), when summarising their discussion of the ethical foundation for resource economics, the “key point is that generations cannot be treated identically”.¹⁴ A main conclusion of this literature is that the ordinary procedure for establishing effectiveness is blocked when **Efficiency** and **Equity** are postulated in the context of an infinite number of generations. More precisely, the *Weierstrass Theorem* cannot be applied in this case since, for relevant classes of technologies, there is no topology that makes the continuity of complete social preferences satisfying the axioms of **Efficiency** and **Equity** compatible with the compactness of the set of feasible paths (cf. e.g. Epstein (1987)).¹⁵ Based on this finding, a common message of the discussion in the literature is that some kind of impatience or discounting has to be imposed. In the extreme this amounts to saying that a rational evaluation of infinite utility streams will unavoidably lead to discriminating against future generations.

In contrast, the present paper’s justification for sustainability indicates that the impression suggested by this literature—that generations cannot be treated equally—is exaggerated. **Efficiency** and **Equity** can well be applied to filter out the non-empty set of efficient and non-decreasing paths as maximal solutions as long as some fairly weak productivity assumptions hold. To establish this positive result we followed Epstein (1986; 1987) in changing the focus from the impossibility of having a continuous ordering on a compact set of feasible utility paths to the possibility of having social preferences that are effective (in the sense of having a non-empty set of maximal elements) in a relevant class of technologies.¹⁶

However, even if one accepts this change in the perception of the problem, an objection might be that the filter provided by the derived incomplete ethical preferences is rather coarse and leads to a set of maximal paths within which no comparison can be made. Apart from the

¹⁴ Similar statements can also be found in the more recent social choice literature (cf. Epstein (1986), Lauwers (1997) or Shinotsuka (1998)).

¹⁵ The topology is not unambiguously given in the infinite number case. Hence, the question is whether there is a topology large enough to allow for continuity and small enough to make interesting sets of feasible utility paths compact. For a discussion of the relevance of the underlying topology for the continuity of social preferences, cf. Diamond (1985), Svensson (1980), Campbell (1985), Lauwers (1997) and Shinotsuka (1998).

¹⁶ Epstein (1987, p. 723) argues that, from a given perspective, “it seems more pertinent to investigate the link between effectiveness and impatience directly, without involving continuity which after all, is at best sufficient and definitely not necessary for existence of optimal paths. Thus, for example, a pertinent question is whether impatience (in some precise sense) is necessary for effectiveness in a relevant set of choice environments.”

technical difficulties in ensuring effectiveness when completeness is imposed, there is also an ethical problem involved in comparing efficient and non-decreasing paths. Going beyond **Efficiency** and **Equity** is not compatible with our aim at establishing an overlapping consensus as no additional unequivocal axioms for resolving distributional conflicts between different generations seem to exist. However, as shown in Proposition 5, basing ethical preferences solely upon the two *focal* axioms of **Efficiency** and **Equity** proved to be fruitful insofar as it was completely sufficient to give a justification for sustainability.

Nevertheless, the incomplete binary relation R_S generated by **Efficiency** and **Equity** could still be deemed unsatisfactory if there were no possibility at all for comparing the R_S -maximal elements in a way which is consistent with **Efficiency** and **Equity**. In that case the **Efficiency** and **Equity** axioms could never be reconciled with the desire to find a solution that is weakly preferred to any other feasible path. However, Proposition 7 below shows that under **Eventual productivity** there exists even a *complete*¹⁷ binary relation that satisfies **Efficiency** and **Equity** and yields a unique (and sustainable) maximal path.

In looking for a complete binary relation that satisfies **Efficiency** and **Equity**, consider the leximin principle. In the case of infinite utility paths the leximin principle yields a complete binary relation on the class of non-decreasing paths: If ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ are non-decreasing, ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ is (strictly) preferred to ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ (i.e. ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ *leximin-dominates* ${}_1\mathbf{u}$) if there is a $s \geq 1$ with $v_t = u_t$ for all $1 \leq t < s$ and $v_s > u_s$. It is possible to extend the domain of the leximin principle in the infinite case beyond the class of non-decreasing paths (cf. Asheim (1991, p. 355)). For a statement of this binary relation, for any ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ and any $T \geq 1$, write ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$ for a permutation of ${}_1\mathbf{u}_T = (u_1, \dots, u_T)$ having the property that ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$ is non-decreasing.

Definition 3: For any two utility paths ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots)$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$, the relation ${}_1\mathbf{v} R'_L {}_1\mathbf{u}$ holds if there is a $\tilde{T} \geq 1$ such that for all $T \geq \tilde{T}$, either ${}_1\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_T = {}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_T$ or there is a $s \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ with $\tilde{v}_t = \tilde{u}_t$ for all $1 \leq t < s$ and $\tilde{v}_s > \tilde{u}_s$.

The binary relation R'_L defined in this way is reflexive, transitive, and satisfies **Efficiency** and **Equity**, implying by Proposition 1 that the Suppes-Sen Grading principle R_S is a subrelation to R'_L . On the class of non-decreasing paths the binary relation R'_L is complete and coincides with the above mentioned leximin principle, while R'_L may not be able to compare two paths if (at

¹⁷ *Completeness* means that ${}_1\mathbf{v} R {}_1\mathbf{u}$ or ${}_1\mathbf{u} R {}_1\mathbf{v}$ for any ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ and ${}_1\mathbf{v}$. Hence, a complete binary relation is able to compare any pair of paths.

least) one is not non-decreasing. However, by invoking Svensson's (1980) Theorem 2,¹⁸ there exists a *complete*, reflexive, and transitive binary relation R_L which has R'_L and thus R_S as a subrelation. Since R_L ranks an efficient path with constant utility above any other feasible path, the following proposition can be established.

*Proposition 7: If the technology satisfies **Eventual Productivity**, then there exists a complete, reflexive, and transitive binary relation R_L , satisfying **Efficiency** and **Equity**, that is effective. Furthermore, for any k_1 there is a unique R_L -maximal path. This utility path is time-consistent and, due to its constant utility, sustainable.*

Proof: R_L has R_S as a subrelation and thus satisfies **Efficiency** and **Equity**. If the technology satisfies **Eventual productivity**, then, for any k_1 , there exists a feasible and efficient path ${}_1\mathbf{u} = (m_1(k_1), m_1(k_1), \dots)$ with constant utility. Since ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is efficient and has constant utility, ${}_1\mathbf{u} P'_L {}_1\mathbf{v}$ (and hence, ${}_1\mathbf{u} P_L {}_1\mathbf{v}$ since R'_L is a subrelation to R_L) where ${}_1\mathbf{v}$ is any alternative path that is feasible given k_1 . Hence, ${}_1\mathbf{u}$ is the unique R_L -maximal path given k_1 . This path is time-consistent, and by Proposition 3, it is also sustainable. QED.

In Proposition 7 R_S is completed by means of the leximin principle. This is only one possibility for constructing complete social preferences that satisfy **Efficiency** and **Equity**. In a technology that satisfies **Immediate Productivity**, a completion of the overtaking criterion may also yield a sustainable path that is preferred to any other path. If we follow this alternative route, however, then we will have to go beyond the framework where utility is only an ordinal measure that is level comparable to the utility level of any other generation. The reason is that use of the overtaking criterion requires that one generation's gain is comparable to another generation's loss. Depending on how we construct a cardinal scale (i.e. how we assign cardinal value to gains and losses at different levels of ordinal utility), a wide diversity of paths can be maximal under the completed overtaking criterion and hence under complete social preferences satisfying **Efficiency** and **Equity** (see e.g. Fleurbaey and Michel, 1999). On the other hand, for a given cardinal scale there need not be any maximal path as the assumption of **Eventual productivity** is not sufficient to ensure that the overtaking criterion is effective.

Another approach to making comparisons among R_S -maximal paths is to let the choice of a R_S -maximal path be a side constraint in a maximisation procedure that does not otherwise take

¹⁸ Svensson's (1980) Theorem 2 states that any reflexive and transitive binary relation that has the Suppes-Sen Grading principle as a subrelation is itself a subrelation to a *complete*, reflexive, and transitive binary relation (i.e. an ordering). In proving this result Svensson refers to a general mathematical Lemma by Szpilrajn (1930).

into account ethical considerations (cf. Asheim (1991), Pezzey (1997)). To fix ideas, consider maximising the sum of discounted utilities in the one-sector model (cf. Example 2) subject to the constraint that the chosen path is non-decreasing and efficient. In this model the *unconstrained* maximum is non-decreasing for an initial capital stock that does not exceed the modified golden rule size. Under such circumstances there is no conflict between discounting utilities and the ethical preferences generated by **Efficiency** and **Equity**.¹⁹

6. Conclusion

The sustainability requirement, which has come to be considered as an important guideline for environmental policy, is a genuinely ethical one as it at least implicitly draws much of its appeal from the desire to be fair towards future generations. It is, however, far less obvious what the precise relation is between intergenerational justice on the one hand and sustainability on the other. There is a long tradition in economics to define justice by referring to the degree of inequality of income distributions, measured e.g. by Lorenz curves. In trying to give a justification for sustainability such an approach was developed by Asheim (1991). In this paper, however, we took a different approach by giving every generation equal treatment in intergenerational social preferences, which in a quite direct way is tantamount to saying that discrimination against future generations is excluded. The **Equity** axiom corresponding to this appealing ethical norm has a long history in the theory of evaluating intergenerational utility paths. It is considered to cause difficulty, because it might be in conflict with the demand for effectiveness. Here we have shown how **Equity** can in a meaningful way be made part of intergenerational ethics, allowing for a straightforward justification for sustainability. At the same time we described what ethical rules in the intergenerational context would be obtained if only the rather incontestable **Efficiency** and **Equity** axioms were adopted. A further question might be how such minimal ethics could be extended in order to give clearer advice on how to resolve distributional conflicts between generations going beyond the sustainability question.

Acknowledgements: We thank three anonymous referees, Aanund Hylland and seminar participants in Zurich, Oslo and Santiago for helpful comments. Figure 1 is due to Minh Ha-Duong. Financial support from the Ruhrgas Foundation is gratefully acknowledged.

¹⁹ Fleurbaey and Michel (1994) provide a criterion for balancing the interests of the different generations which explicitly depends on the underlying technology. One could also use their criterion for making a choice between non-decreasing paths.

References

- Asheim, G. B. (1991), Unjust Intergenerational Allocations, *Journal of Economic Theory* 54, 350-371.
- Asheim, G. B. (1996), Ethical Preferences in the Presence of Resource Constraints, *Nordic Journal of Political Economy* 23, 55-67.
- Asheim, G. B. and K. A. Brekke (1997), Sustainability when Capital Management has Stochastic Consequences, Memorandum no. 9/1997, Department of Economics, University of Oslo.
- Blackorby, C., D. Donaldson and J. A. Weymark, (1984), Social Choice with Interpersonal Utility Comparisons: A Diagrammatic Introduction, *International Economic Review* 25, 327-356.
- Buchholz, W. (1997), Intergenerational Equity, in: T. Zylicz (ed.), *Ecological Economics*, a volume in the series *A Sustainable Baltic Region*, Uppsala University, Uppsala, 19-22.
- Campbell, D. E. (1985), Impossibility Theorems and Infinite Horizons Planning, *Social Choice and Welfare* 2, 283-293.
- Cass, D. and T. Mitra (1991), Indefinitely Sustained Consumption Despite Exhaustible Natural Resources, *Economic Theory* 1, 119-146.
- Chichilnisky, G. (1996), An Axiomatic Approach to Sustainable Development, *Social Choice and Welfare* 13, 231-257.
- Chichilnisky, G. (1997), What is Sustainable Development?, *Land Economics* 73, 467-491.
- Dasgupta, P. S. and G. M. Heal (1979), *Economic Theory and Exhaustible Resources*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge U.K.
- Dasgupta, S. and T. Mitra (1983), Intergenerational Equity and Efficient Allocation of Exhaustible Resources, *International Economic Review* 24, 133-153.
- d'Aspremont, C. and L. Gevers (1977), Equity and the Informational Basis of Collective Choice, *Review of Economic Studies* 44, 199-209.
- Diamond, P. (1965), The Evaluation of Infinite Utility Streams, *Econometrica* 33, 170-177.
- Epstein, L. G. (1986), Intergenerational Preference Orderings, *Social Choice and Welfare* 3, 151-160.
- Epstein, L. G. (1987), Impatience, in: J. Eatwell et al. (eds.), *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*, Macmillan, London, 720-723.
- Fleurbaey, M. and P. Michel (1994), Optimal Growth and Transfers between Generations, *Recherches Economiques de Louvain* 60, 281-300.

- Fleurbaey, M. and P. Michel (1999), Quelques réflexions sur la croissance optimale, *Revue Économique* 50, 715-732.
- Hamilton, K. (1995), Sustainable Development, the Hartwick Rule and Optimal Growth, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 5, 393-411.
- Hammond, P. J. (1976), Equity, Arrow's Conditions, and Rawls' Difference Principle, *Econometrica* 44, 753-803.
- Heal, G. M. (1998), *Valuing the Future: Economic Theory and Sustainability*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Koopmans, T. C. (1960), Stationary Ordinal Utility and Impatience, *Econometrica* 28, 287-309.
- Krautkraemer, J. (1998), Nonrenewable Resource Scarcity, *Journal of Economic Literature* 36, 2065-2107.
- Lauwers, L. (1997), Continuity and Equity with Infinite Horizons, *Social Choice and Welfare* 14, 345-356.
- Madden, P. (1996), Suppes-Sen Dominance, Generalised Lorenz Dominance and the Welfare Economics of Competitive Equilibrium - Some Examples, *Journal of Public Economics* 61, 247-262.
- Mongin, P. and C. d'Aspremont (1996), Utility Theory and Ethics, in: S. Barbera, P. J. Hammond and C. Seidl (eds.), *Handbook of Utility Theory*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston (forthcoming).
- Pezzey, J. (1997), Sustainability Constraints versus "Optimality" versus Intertemporal Concern, and Axioms versus Data, *Land Economics* 73, 448-466.
- Pigou, A. (1952), *The Economics of Welfare*, Macmillan, London.
- Ramsey, F. (1928), A Mathematical Theory of Saving, *Economic Journal* 38, 543-559.
- Rawls, J. (1971), *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rawls, J. (1993), *Political Liberalism*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Roemer, J. E. (1996), *Theories of Distributive Justice*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. and London, England.
- Sandler, T. (1997), *Global Challenges: An Approach to Environmental, Political, and Economic Problems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge U.K.
- Saposnik, R. (1983), On Evaluating Income Distribution: Rank Dominance, the Suppes-Sen Grading Principle of Justice, and Pareto-Optimality, *Public Choice* 40, 329-336.
- Sen, A. K. (1970), *Collective Choice and Social Welfare*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh.
- Sidgwick, H. (1907), *The Methods of Ethics*, Macmillan, London.

- Shinotsuka, T. (1998), Equity, Continuity, and Myopia: A Generalisation of Diamond's Impossibility Theorem, *Social Choice and Welfare* 15, 21-30.
- Solow, R. M. (1974), Intergenerational Equity and Exhaustible Resources, *Review of Economic Studies*. Symposium, 3-28.
- Suppes, P. (1966), Some Formal Models of Grading Principles, *Synthese* 6, 284-306.
- Svensson, L. G. (1980), Equity among Generations, *Econometrica* 48, 1251-1256.
- Szpilrajn, E. (1930), Sur l'Extension de l'Ordre Partial, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 16, 386-389.
- Toman, M. A., J. Pezzey, and J. Krautkraemer (1995), Neoclassical Economic Growth Theory and 'Sustainability', in: D.W. Bromley (ed.), *Handbook of Environmental Economics*, Blackwell, Oxford, 139-165.
- Vallentyne, P. (1993), Utilitarianism and infinite utility, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 71, 212-217.
- Vallentyne, P. (1995), Infinite utility: Anonymity and person-centredness, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 71, 212-217.
- Vallentyne, P. and S. Kagan (1997), Infinite value and finitely additive value theory, *Journal of Philosophy* 94, 5-26.
- van Liedekerke, L. and L. Lauwers (1997), Sacrificing the Patrol: Utilitarianism, Future Generations and Infinity, *Economics and Philosophy* 13, 159-174.
- von Weizsäcker, C. C. (1965), Existence of Optimal Programmes of Accumulation for an Infinite Time Horizon, *Review of Economic Studies* 32, 85-104.
- WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development) (1987), *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.