Journal of
Ethics and Emerging Technologies

IEET

Article

From The Sentiment Exchange to Emotional Economics 2.0: Towards a Post-Scarcity Social Contract

Linda Campagnolo[1]

[1]Ph.D. Candidate, independent researcher, Italy,[1] lindacampagnolo1985@gmail.com

Abstract: This article builds upon previous research on the ethical tokenization of emotions and the concept of a 'Sentiment Exchange,' advancing it into a broader normative framework termed Emotional Economics 2.0. That initial contribution demonstrated how affective signals could be measured, exchanged, and governed to ensure dignity and fairness within digital economies. The present paper extends this framework into a broader theoretical model termed Emotional Economics 2.0, articulated through three normative laws. The First Law conceptualizes human attention as a conserved and finite resource, grounding emotional value in cognitive limitations rather than artificial scarcity. The Second Law introduces emotional flow as the basis of value creation, operationalized through a dual-channel system: a fixed universal allocation of 20 tokens per day to each individual and a variable issuance tied to the measurable emotional impact of registered entities. The Third Law formulates a global emotional sovereignty contract, envisioning emotional tokens as a universal right akin to a digital basic income embedded at the protocol level.

The paper further explores Scenario 4, where emotional tokens function as a universal unit of account in a post-scarcity "post-economy." Illustrative examples—such as housing, food, and luxury goods denominated in tokens—demonstrate how this model reframes wealth, value, and redistribution. Legal challenges, governance mechanisms (Global Ethical-Scientific Committee and Decentralized Autonomous Organization), and risks of manipulation are addressed as integral to the model's design rather than as afterthoughts. By explicitly linking the original Sentiment Exchange proposal with the Three Laws of Emotional Economics, this work positions itself as a second step in an evolving research program. Rather than a predictive claim, it advances a normative horizon: an alternative to neoliberal scarcity logics that places dignity, emotions, and collective well-being at the center of economic thought.

Keywords: Sentiment Exchange, Emotional Economics, Post-Economy, Universal Basic Income, Attention Economy, Neoliberalism, Blockchain Ethics

Citation: Campagnolo Linda. 2026. Title. *Journal of Ethics and Emerging Technologies* 36: 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/10.55613/jeet.v36i1.198

Received: 07/10/2025
Accepted: 25/11/2025
Published: 15/01/2026

Publisher's Note: IEET stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

1. Introduction

The paper continues a line of inquiry initially introduced in earlier research on the Sentiment Exchange, extending it into a comprehensive normative paradigm. That first contribution demonstrated how emotional signals—long treated as peripheral or intangible—could be systematically measured, tokenized, and ethically exchanged through a blockchain-mediated marketplace. At its core, early affective-economy models proposed that emotions, when ethically safeguarded, could serve as legitimate units of economic interaction, thereby complementing or even challenging traditional financial logics based on scarcity and accumulation.

The present article advances this agenda by moving from the experimental design of an exchange platform toward a general theoretical framework of Emotional Economics 2.0. Whereas the initial proposal focused on the ethical conditions under which affective data could circulate without reproducing exploitation, the current model develops three normative laws that establish a more ambitious claim: that attention and emotional flow are not residual aspects of economic life but its primary sources of value.

This transition is motivated by broader intellectual and social shifts. Contemporary capitalism, often described as neoliberalism, has systematically extended market logics into domains of life previously considered non-economic, from health to education to social relations. Yet this extension has been accompanied by paradoxes: unprecedented technological abundance coexists with narratives of scarcity; hyperconnectivity produces both attention saturation and emotional exhaustion; and global finance has decoupled from social trust and collective well-being. In this context, new theoretical frameworks are urgently required—frameworks that both diagnose the inadequacy of scarcity-driven economics and offer alternative imaginaries for post-scarcity futures.

Emotional Economics 2.0 responds to this demand by articulating three normative principles: the Conservation of Attention, the Primacy of Emotional Flow, and Global Emotional Sovereignty. Together, these laws propose a novel architecture of value and redistribution. Specifically, they establish a dual-channel token system—one fixed and universal, the other variable and performance-based—through which dignity is guaranteed while positive emotional impact is incentivized. The implications extend to what we term Scenario 4, a speculative but rigorous depiction of a "post-economy" where emotional tokens replace fiat money as the universal unit of account, reconfiguring wealth and markets around abundance rather than scarcity.

Importantly, this paper does not present a technical forecast or policy blueprint. Rather, it advances a normative horizon designed to provoke debate, inspire experimentation, and expand the ethical vocabulary available to both economics and philosophy. By situating itself as a direct continuation of the Sentiment Exchange, the article consolidates an ongoing research program aimed at transforming how value is conceived, distributed, and governed in digital societies.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Scarcity in Classical and Neoclassical Economics

The notion of scarcity has been the foundational axiom of modern economics. Adam Smith (1776/1994) framed markets as mechanisms for allocating scarce resources through the "invisible hand," a principle formalized later in neoclassical marginalist theory (Jevons, 1871/2013; Walras, 1874/2010). David Ricardo (1817/2016) emphasized comparative advantage under scarcity, while Malthus (1798/2008) linked demographic pressure to inevitable limits on subsistence. Karl Marx (1867/1990), in contrast, understood scarcity as socially produced through capital accumulation and alienation rather than a natural constraint. Keynes (1936/2018) anticipated a possible "post-scarcity" society, envisioning technological progress reducing the need for labor. Yet neoliberal thought, especially Hayek (1944/2007) and Friedman (1962/2002), reinforced scarcity as the legitimating ground of competitive markets and limited state intervention. In short, the ontological primacy of scarcity continues to anchor economic reasoning, as rooted in classical and neoliberal traditions (Polanyi, 1994/2001).

2.2 Neoliberalism and Its Critiques

Neoliberalism emerged as a dominant paradigm in the late twentieth century, privileging deregulation, privatization, and market logics (Harvey, 2005; Brown, 2015). It has been critiqued for exacerbating inequality (Piketty, 2014), hollowing out democratic sovereignty (Streeck, 2017), and reshaping individuals as entrepreneurial selves (Foucault, 2008;

Mirowski, 2013). Scholars argue neoliberalism is less a neutral science than a political project privileging capital (Peck, 2010). Alternatives emphasize commons-based approaches (Ostrom, 1991) and heterodox economics (Raworth, 2017), yet neoliberal rationality remains hegemonic. The current proposal builds on critiques highlighting the need for paradigms not grounded in scarcity or accumulation but in human dignity and emotional well-being.

2.3. Cryptocurrencies and Digital Scarcity

Bitcoin epitomizes digital scarcity, with its fixed supply of 21 million coins (Nakamoto, 2008). Its architecture produces artificial scarcity through cryptographic consensus, embedding scarcity into code (Maurer et al., 2013). Critics argue this generates speculative bubbles and social inefficiency (Davidson et al., 2018; Golumbia, 2016). Yet cryptocurrencies introduced a paradigm of "programmable money" (Narayanan et al., 2016), allowing governance through code. Ethereum expanded this logic with smart contracts (Buterin, 2014). Still, empirical studies show concentration of wealth and energy consumption undermine emancipatory claims (Krause & Tolaymat, 2018). Emotional Economics contrasts with this scarcity-driven logic by proposing endogenous abundance tied to attention and emotions rather than fixed caps.

2.4. Emotional Value and Non-Scarcity Stability Models

Recent approaches in behavioral and post-Keynesian economics have explored value stabilization mechanisms not based on material scarcity but on trust and relational feedback loops (Dosi & Roventini, 2019).

In parallel, affective computing studies have explored how emotional equilibrium may function as a dynamic reference point for systemic stability.

Emotional Economics extends these ideas by formalizing a protocol-level feedback between affective value and token issuance, transforming emotional trust into a measurable stabilizer of economic flow.

2.5. The Attention Economy

Herbert Simon et al. (1971) famously described attention as the "bottleneck" of information-rich societies. Subsequent scholarship emphasized attention as the scarcest resource of digital capitalism (Davenport & Beck, 2001; Wu, 2016). Platforms commodify attention through surveillance capitalism (Zuboff, 2019), monetizing engagement at scale. The ethical concern is that human cognitive capacities are exploited without fair redistribution (Fuchs, 2014). Proposals for alternative models include treating attention as a commons and measuring attentional value flows (Terranova, 2012). Emotional tokenization builds directly on this lineage, reframing attention as a conserved, distributable resource and embedding equity into its circulation.

2.6. Emotions, Value, and Ethics

Recent scholarship highlights the centrality of affect and emotion in value creation. Affective economies demonstrate how feelings circulate socially, producing value and attachments (Ahmed, 2004). Affective computing integrates biometric sensing to quantify emotions (Picard, 1997; Calvo & Peters, 2014), raising ethical questions of surveillance and manipulation (McStay, 2018). Behavioral economics has long shown emotions influence decisions (Kahneman, 2011; Loewenstein, 2000). In media and marketing, emotional capital has measurable financial impact (Bagozzi et al., 1999). Previous work by

Campagnolo (2025) proposed the Emotional Equity Index, framing affective signals as ethically mediated units of value within digital economies. Emotional Economics 2.0 extends this logic by embedding redistribution and universality into the protocol, avoiding commodification while acknowledging emotional value.

2.7. Universal Basic Income and Redistribution

Universal Basic Income (UBI) has been widely discussed as a policy for addressing inequality and automation-driven displacement (Van Parijs & Vanderborght, 2017). Experiments in Finland (Kangas et al., 2019) and Kenya (Banerjee et al., 2019) demonstrated modest improvements in well-being but raised fiscal sustainability concerns (Standing, 2017). Critics argue UBI may depoliticize redistribution (Frase, 2016). Emotional Economics rethinks redistribution by making it endogenous: the universal issuance of daily emotional tokens guarantees dignity without requiring taxation or external funding. This positions the model as a built-in, technologically mediated social contract.

2.8. Alternative Indicators Beyond GDP

The inadequacy of GDP as a measure of welfare is well documented (Stiglitz et al., 2009). Alternatives include the Human Development Index (UNDP, 1990), Genuine Progress Indicator (Kubiszewski et al., 2013), and Gross National Happiness (Ura et al., 2012). These measures broaden evaluation to well-being, sustainability, and happiness. However, they remain external indicators rather than integrated into monetary architecture. Emotional tokens bridge this gap by embodying emotional flows as both a unit of account and a measure of value, positioning them as a new indicator-practice hybrid.

2.9. Governance, Commons, and Global Justice

The governance of digital economies has been a major challenge. Cryptocurrencies often rely on decentralized consensus, yet governance crises such as Ethereum's DAO hack reveal vulnerabilities (DuPont, 2019). Debates on global commons governance highlight the need for hybrid structures combining expert knowledge and democratic legitimacy (Hess & Ostrom, 2007). Ethical oversight in AI (Floridi et al., 2018) illustrates possible models. Emotional Economics proposes a Global Ethical-Scientific Committee (GESC) coupled with a Decentralized Autonomous Organization (DAO), balancing expertise and transparency. This hybrid governance aligns with proposals for "constitutional moments" in digital economies (Balkin, 2018).

2.10. Critical Theory and Post-Economy

Critical theory challenges capitalist axioms, emphasizing alienation, commodification, and the possibilities of post-capitalist futures (Žižek, 2010). Post-capitalist imaginaries emphasize abundance and commons (Mason, 2015; Srnicek & Williams, 2015). Theories of degrowth (Latouche, 2009; Kallis, 2018) propose reorienting value away from GDP growth. Emotional Economics contributes to this discourse by articulating a "post-economy," where value is no longer grounded in scarcity or capital accumulation but in the dignity of shared emotional flows. This positions it as a normative horizon beyond neoliberal rationality.

2.11. Media as Accelerators of Adoption

Media play a critical role in accelerating the adoption of new economic imaginaries. Agenda-setting theory (McCombs & Shaw, 1972) shows how media shape public priorities. The mediatization of society amplifies the influence of narratives (Hjarvard, 2008; Couldry & Hepp, 2017). Rogers' (2003) diffusion of innovations emphasizes communication channels in adoption curves, while Castells (2009) underscores the power of networks in shaping social change. Media can legitimize new currencies—as seen in Bitcoin's rise from fringe to mainstream (Golumbia, 2016). Emotional Economics recognizes this dynamic: media narratives are not mere communication tools but structural accelerators of legitimacy, capable of catalyzing post-economic imaginaries in moments of crisis.

3. Theoretical Framework

Building on the conceptual foundation established in previous research, this paper extends that framework into a general model of Emotional Economics 2.0, integrating attention, emotional flow, and global dignity. At its core lies a Global Emotional Social Contract, which redefines value creation and distribution around human attention, emotional circulation, and universal dignity. This framework is articulated through three guiding principles, which together constitute the constitutional pillars of the proposed post-economic order.

3.1 Conservation of Attention

The first principle asserts that human attention is a finite and non-replicable resource. In contrast to traditional commodities, attention cannot be artificially produced beyond the natural limits of a day. This principle anchors the legitimacy of emotional tokens, ensuring that their issuance is grounded in a resource that is simultaneously universal, scarce, and ethically distributed. Attention thereby becomes the ontological foundation for the unit of account in the emotional economy.

3.2 Emotional Flow and Circulation

The second principle establishes that emotional value emerges not from hoarding but from circulation. In practical terms, this is realized through a dual-channel system of token distribution:

A fixed allocation of 20 emotional tokens per individual per day, serving as an unconditional dignity-based income. These tokens are not accumulable beyond the month but may be invested or exchanged within that timeframe, guaranteeing universal access and baseline participation.

A variable issuance of additional tokens, generated in proportion to the verified positive emotional impact of institutions, organizations, and creators. This ensures that collective contributions to well-being are rewarded, while speculative accumulation without impact is disincentivized.

Together, these two channels balance universality and innovation, protecting individuals while incentivizing societal actors to create long-term positive emotional environments.

3.3 Global Emotional Sovereignty

The third principle defines emotional sovereignty as a universal human right. Every person, by virtue of their existence, participates in the emotional economy through unconditional access to daily tokens. Governance of this system relies on a hybrid model: a Global Ethical-Scientific Committee (GESC) establishes normative guidelines, while a Decentralized Autonomous Organization (DAO) ensures transparency, democratic oversight, and algorithmic accountability. This dual structure is designed to safeguard against monopolization, bias, and manipulation.

3.4 Scenario 4: The Post-Economy

Taken together, these principles sketch a speculative horizon beyond neoliberal capitalism, here described as Scenario 4 – The Post-Economy. In this scenario, emotional tokens function as a universal unit of account. Goods and services may be priced directly in tokens: for example, a book could cost 10 tokens, a month of housing 300, and healthcare services 150, while digital cultural content may circulate at micro-costs of 1–2 tokens. Crucially, the universal daily allocation ensures that no individual is excluded from participating in this economy.

3.4.1 Empirical Illustration (Pilot Simulation)

To illustrate the operational dynamics of Scenario 4, imagine a pilot community of 10,000 individuals where each receives 20 emotional tokens daily. A university, a cultural cooperative, and a municipal institution register positive affective impact scores ranging from 0.8 to 1.6. Variable issuance then amplifies token flows by 40–160%, generating stable redistribution cycles aligned with measured emotional trust. This simulation highlights how emotional value can circulate endogenously without external fiscal input, demonstrating the practical feasibility of dignity-based redistribution.

3.5 The Symbolic Value of Six and Six Million

Within this normative horizon, the number six acquires central symbolic significance. Derived from the fixed allocation (20 tokens per day × 30 days = 600 tokens per month), the figure "6" becomes the semiotic anchor of the social contract. By convention, setting the symbolic value of one token at €10,000 results in a benchmark of €6 million per month. This figure is not an empirical forecast but a symbolic minimum of dignity: the lowest admissible threshold of human recognition within the emotional economy. Below this benchmark, dignity would be considered violated. The "Contract 6" thus provides a normative baseline that transforms the abstract notion of dignity into a measurable, universally applicable horizon.

3.6 Methodological Note: Derivation of the Three Laws

The formulation of the Three Laws of Emotional Economics was guided by a normative-reconstructive method structured across three analytical layers.

First, a genealogical layer analyzed foundational concepts such as scarcity and attention, aiming to uncover their historical and conceptual role in legitimizing economic systems. This allowed for a critical reframing of attention as a non-replicable, ethically relevant resource.

Second, a systemic layer examined the circulation of emotions in digital environments, not as isolated individual states, but as relational flows capable of generating collective value. Emotional flow, in this view, functions as a stabilizing mechanism and ethical vector in social dynamics.

Third, an ethical-constitutional synthesis integrated these insights into a normative horizon, constructing a global emotional framework based on dignity, universality, and sovereignty. Rather than predicting empirical trends, this approach builds a conceptual foundation for rethinking value and redistribution beyond scarcity. Together, these layers offered a coherent path for deriving the Three Laws—Attention as conserved value, Emotional Flow as the basis of creation, and Emotional Sovereignty as universal right—within a unified post-economic paradigm.

4. Legal Challenges & Governance

4.1 Legal Classification and Hybrid Regulatory Models

Any system proposing the issuance of universally allocated tokens inevitably faces the challenge of monetary sovereignty. States and supranational entities such as central banks or the International Monetary Fund traditionally monopolize the creation of legal tender. While emotional tokens are not designed to replace fiat money, they nonetheless destabilize this monopoly by embedding redistribution directly into a blockchain protocol.

4.1.1 Hybrid Legal Models and Analogies

Emotional tokens share structural similarities with emerging impact-based financial instruments, rather than with speculative cryptocurrencies. Three reference models are particularly relevant:

1. Carbon Credits, which quantify and reward verified environmental impact;

2. Social Impact Bonds, which link financial returns to measurable social outcomes;

3. Complementary Currencies, which function as community-based redistribution systems.

Emotional tokens combine these logics by making emotional well-being the measure of verified impact, circulating through a transparent and ethical protocol.

Their dual identity—(1) as social right instruments ensuring a universal baseline of dignity, and (2) as impact-based credits rewarding collective emotional contribution—positions them within a hybrid legal category that merges social rights with programmable economic instruments.

4.1.2 Regulatory Frameworks

Within the European context, the Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA, 2023) provides a useful reference point, even if emotional tokens diverge fundamentally from speculative assets. Their purpose is not investment but universal participation and emotional equity. Similarly, the OECD Guidelines on Social Impact Investment (2019) offer a framework for recognizing emotional tokens as a new class of impact-based digital rights.

4.1.3 Comparative Overview

Comparative Legal Classification of Emotional Tokens, emotional tokens occupy an intermediate space between digital assets and social policy instruments. Their recognition would require a plural legal regime that acknowledges impact value as a legitimate category alongside financial value.

4.1.4 Conclusion

In this perspective, emotional tokens can be understood as a digital social right, codified through blockchain architecture and ethically governed by the GESC + DAO system. They call for the emergence of a new legal paradigm—the right to emotional value—where dignity, transparency, and measurable impact form the juridical foundation of the post-economic order.

4.2 Privacy, Data Protection, and Ethical Boundaries

Because emotional tokens rely on measurable affective signals, concerns about privacy and data protection are paramount. Emotional data—derived from self-report, sensors, or digital traces—fall within the category of sensitive personal information, subject to strict protections under frameworks like the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Without strong safeguards, the system risks reproducing the very surveillance capitalism it seeks to overcome.

To address this, Emotional Economics 2.0 incorporates privacy-by-design protocols: data is aggregated and anonymized before tokenization, ensuring that no individual's raw emotions can be commodified or tracked. Cryptographic techniques, such as zero-knowledge proofs, allow validation of emotional impact without revealing personal data. Moreover, algorithmic assessments must be regularly audited to prevent bias toward high-intensity emotions (e.g., fear, outrage) and to incentivize sustainable affective value (trust, care, solidarity).

4.3 Governance Architecture: GESC + DAO

The governance of emotional tokens requires a hybrid model that combines ethical oversight with decentralized participation. Emotional Economics 2.0 therefore proposes a Global Ethical-Scientific Committee (GESC) paired with a Decentralized Autonomous Organization (DAO).

GESC sets the normative and ethical standards, ensuring that token issuance and use respect principles of dignity, equity, and justice. Its composition includes ethicists, economists, technologists, and civil society representatives. Crucially, GESC defines the "emotional impact metrics" by which variable token issuance is calculated.

DAO provides decentralized technical governance, enabling participants to monitor issuance, vote on updates, and verify algorithmic transparency. Smart contracts encode the universal daily issuance of 20 tokens and enforce the expiration of non-accumulated tokens. The DAO structure ensures resilience: no central authority can unilaterally manipulate emotional currency.

Together, GESC and DAO embody a checks-and-balances system: ethical deliberation at the top, participatory transparency at the base. This dual structure responds both to critiques of centralized technocracy and to fears of algorithmic anarchy.

4.4 Toward Legal Pluralism and Global Recognition

In the short term, emotional tokens are most viable within local or sectoral sandboxes: universities, municipalities, or online platforms where universal daily issuance can be tested legally as a complementary currency. Such pilot projects parallel earlier experiments with local currencies and Universal Basic Income trials.

Over time, successful implementations could justify recognition by international treaties analogous to those regulating carbon markets or environmental commons. The ultimate goal is legal pluralism: a layered system where emotional tokens coexist with fiat currencies but gradually acquire status as legitimate instruments of value and redistribution.

This legal trajectory aligns with the Scenario 4 horizon, in which emotional tokens serve as the universal unit of account. For this shift to gain legitimacy, governance must ensure that the tokens remain ethically grounded, resistant to manipulation, and institutionally accountable. In this sense, law does not simply constrain Emotional Economics; it is itself redefined as the architecture of dignity, codified in protocols and overseen by both human committees and algorithmic processes.

5. Discussion

5.1 Comparative Perspectives: Bitcoin, UBI, and GDP

The present framework evolves conceptually from previous explorations of affective value, reframing them within a post-scarcity and redistributive logic.

Bitcoin and Cryptocurrencies. Bitcoin epitomizes the economic paradigm of artificial scarcity, with its 21 million cap designed to replicate the logic of gold. Its legitimacy rests on consensus-based proof-of-work, which ensures scarcity through energy expenditure. Emotional tokens invert this logic: rather than restricting issuance, they embed abundance through daily universal allocation, combined with variable issuance linked to emotional impact. While Bitcoin fosters inequality through speculative accumulation, emotional tokens redistribute value from the start, integrating dignity into the architecture of issuance.

Universal Basic Income. UBI represents an attempt to guarantee minimum security through unconditional transfers. Yet it depends on state budgets, taxation, or debt, which renders it vulnerable to political resistance and fiscal crises. Emotional tokens, by contrast, internalize redistribution: the 20 daily tokens per individual are minted as part of the protocol itself, requiring no fiscal extraction. This makes Emotional Economics a form of endogenous UBI, technologically embedded and globally uniform.

GDP and Value Indicators. GDP measures productive output but ignores well-being, equity, or emotional life. Emotional tokens create a new unit of account where emotions themselves are valued and circulated, offering an alternative metric for social progress. Instead of supplementing GDP with external indices such as Gross National Happiness, Emotional Economics makes emotional well-being endogenous to the economic system itself.

5.2 Addressing the Critique of Inflation

A frequent objection is that unconditional issuance of tokens would generate hyperinflation, eroding value. Emotional Economics responds by redefining the very notion of inflation. Since emotional tokens are not pegged to fiat currency but constitute a self-referential unit of account, their value does not depend on scarcity or exchange rates.

The dual-channel system stabilizes value: fixed tokens guarantee universality without excess accumulation (due to expiration), while variable tokens are issued only in proportion to verified emotional impact. This ensures that token supply grows in correlation with genuine affective value creation, not arbitrarily. Inflation, in the fiat sense, becomes conceptually irrelevant.

Table 5.2 compares the inflationary mechanisms of fiat currencies with the endogenous dynamics of emotional tokens.

Table 5.2 – Comparison Between Fiat Inflation and Emotional Token Dynamics

Feature	Fiat Currencies (Traditional Inflation)	Emotional Tokens (Endogenous Dynamics)
Unit of Value	Money issued by central banks	Tokens generated from verified emotional flows and impact
Principle of Value	Based on scarcity and institutional trust	Based on attention and shared emotional value
Issuance Control	Monetary authorities (ECB, FED)	Algorithmic protocol + GESC/DAO oversight
Cause of Inflation	Excess money supply / aggregate demand	Imbalance between emotional flow and verified impact
Value Stabilization	Fiscal and monetary policy interventions	Self-limiting flow (non-accumulable tokens)
Redistribution	Dependent on taxation and policy decisions	Built into protocol (20 universal daily tokens)
Main Risk	Loss of purchasing power	Affective manipulation or emotional signal distortion
Welfare Indicator	GDP, inflation, unemployment rate	Emotional impact index and collective trust level

This comparative framework illustrates how Emotional Economics redefines monetary stability and redistribution by making emotional value an intrinsic component of the economic system.

As shown above, emotional tokens internalize abundance and ethical redistribution at the protocol level, eliminating the dependence on scarcity and centralized fiscal control typical of fiat systems.

5.3 Addressing the Critique of Governance and Sovereignty

Skeptics argue that emotional tokens threaten state sovereignty by bypassing monetary control. Yet sovereignty here is reconceptualized: the Global Emotional Sovereignty Contract guarantees that each person is a sovereign subject of value, independent of nationality.

Institutionally, the governance model avoids both extremes: it neither entrusts control to centralized states nor abandons it to anarchic markets. Instead, the GESC + DAO architecture provides a layered system of oversight. This hybrid design allows for ethical rule-setting, algorithmic transparency, and collective participation, addressing the risk of technocratic capture or corporate monopolization.

5.4 Addressing the Critique of Manipulation

The most serious risk lies in the potential manipulation of emotions. If economic value derives from affective signals, organizations might attempt to exploit or artificially generate emotions for profit. Emotional Economics 2.0 anticipates this objection by embedding safeguards:

Dual-channel separation ensures that the universal daily allocation is immune to manipulation.

Privacy-by-design prevents raw emotional data from being commodified, using aggregation and cryptographic validation.

Audit mechanisms ensure that emotional impact metrics reward sustainable affect (trust, solidarity) rather than volatile sensationalism.

Governance checks make manipulation costly and normatively unacceptable, with GESC oversight and DAO transparency.

Thus, what appears a vulnerability becomes an ethical strength: Emotional Economics foregrounds manipulation as a systemic risk and builds anti-manipulation protocols into its design.

5.5 Emotional Economics as Post-Economy

Taken together, these comparisons and responses suggest that Emotional Economics is not a reform of existing paradigms but a post-economic horizon. It surpasses scarcity-based systems (Bitcoin), fiscally dependent redistribution (UBI), and productionist measures (GDP). Instead, it integrates abundance, redistribution, and well-being at the protocol level.

The proposal is normative and speculative: it does not claim immediate feasibility but aims to expand the conceptual vocabulary of economics. By embedding dignity and emotional value into currency itself, Emotional Economics outlines a model for an era in which markets are no longer organized solely around scarcity and profit, but around flows of trust, attention, and collective emotional well-being.

6. Conclusion

This paper has advanced the framework of Emotional Economics 2.0, extending previous explorations of affective value systems into a fully articulated normative architecture. At its core lie the Three Laws of Emotional Economics: (1) the conservation of human attention as a finite resource, (2) the creation of value through the flow of emotional tokens distributed via a dual-channel system (fixed universal allocation plus variable issuance linked to impact), and (3) the recognition of a Global Emotional Sovereignty Contract, which institutionalizes dignity by guaranteeing a baseline of emotional value for every individual.

Together, these laws reconfigure the foundations of economic theory. Instead of scarcity as the principle of legitimacy, abundance and circulation become the drivers of value. Instead of redistribution as a politically contingent afterthought, redistribution is endogenously coded into the system itself. Instead of GDP as the ultimate measure of progress, emotional well-being and affective trust emerge as central indicators. In this sense, Emotional Economics is not a supplement to existing paradigms but an alternative epistemology—a reorientation of how value, rights, and governance are conceptualized in a digitized and affective society.

The Discussion has highlighted both comparisons and objections. Against Bitcoin, emotional tokens are non-scarce, redistributive, and ethically grounded. Against UBI, they require no fiscal extraction but embed universality into protocol. Against GDP, they move beyond productionist logic by internalizing affective value as the very substance of economic exchange. Objections regarding inflation, governance, and manipulation were not dismissed but addressed structurally: inflation is redefined within a self-referential unit of account; governance is hybridized through the dual GESC + DAO model; and manipulation is anticipated through safeguards such as privacy-by-design and robust affective metrics.

What emerges is not a utopia but a post-economic horizon: a normative model that reframes the economy as an ethical architecture of dignity, trust, and shared emotional sovereignty. Like earlier economic paradigms—mercantilism, classical political economy, Keynesianism, or neoliberalism—Emotional Economics does not present itself as a neutral science but as a political vision of how value should be defined and distributed. Its speculative nature is therefore not a weakness but a strength: by shifting the frame of debate, it creates conceptual space for experiments, critiques, and transformations that existing categories cannot accommodate.

From a practical perspective, the path forward lies not in immediate global adoption but in gradual experimentation. Pilot projects in local communities, digital platforms, or universities could test universal token distribution and variable issuance rules. Regulatory sandboxes could legitimize emotional tokens as complementary currencies, much as carbon credits and local currencies gained recognition over time. The media, as highlighted in the literature review, play a crucial role in shaping legitimacy and accelerating adoption. Over the long term, international treaties could institutionalize emotional tokens within a pluralist monetary ecosystem.

As a second step in an ongoing inquiry into emotion-based economies, this paper consolidates the transition from experimental design to normative theory. The model challenges the dominance of scarcity, profit maximization, and fiscal dependency, and instead foregrounds abundance, dignity, and shared responsibility as the ethical basis of value. It does not claim to predict the future of money but to reimagine the future of economics itself.

In conclusion, the Three Laws of Emotional Economics provide a conceptual framework for thinking about post-economy not as an impossibility or a utopia, but as a normative horizon—a set of principles to guide innovation, governance, and collective imagination. Whether or not emotional tokens are ever fully realized as a global currency, the intellectual contribution of this framework lies in demonstrating that alternative architectures of value are possible. By linking human attention, emotional flows, and universal dignity, Emotional Economics calls for a transformation of economic thought: from scarcity to abundance, from accumulation to flow, and from neutrality to ethics.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declare no conflict of interest.

References

Ahmed, S. (2004). The cultural politics of emotion. Edinburgh University Press.

Bagozzi, R. P., Gopinath, M., & Nyer, P. U. (1999). The role of emotions in marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 27(2), 184–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070399272005

Balkin, J. M. (2018). Free speech in the algorithmic society. Yale Law School.

Banerjee, A., Niehaus, P., & Suri, T. (2019). Universal basic income in the developing world. Annual Review of Economics. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030229

Brown, W. (2015). Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution. Zone Books.

Buterin, V. (2014). A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform. Ethereum White Paper.

Calvo, R. A., & Peters, D. (2014). Positive computing. MIT Press.

Campagnolo, L. (2025). The sentiment exchange: Ethical innovation in the blockchain-based economy of emotions. Business Ethics and Leadership. https://doi.org/10.61093/bel.9(3).15-26.2025

Castells, M. (2009). Communication power. Oxford University Press.

Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2016). The mediated construction of reality. Polity.

Davidson, S., De Filippi, P., & Potts, J. (2018). Economics of blockchain. Journal of Institutional Economics. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744137417000200

Davenport, T. H., & Beck, J. C. (2001). The attention economy. ACM Magazines. https://doi.org/10.1145/376625.376626

Dosi, G., & Roventini, A. (2019). More is different... and complex! The case for agent-based macroeconomics. Journal of Evolutionary Economics, 29(1), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-019-00609-y

DuPont, Q. (2019). Cryptocurrencies and blockchains. Polity.

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for AI. Minds and Machines, 28, 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

Foucault, M. (2008). The birth of biopolitics. Palgrave.

Frase, P. (2016). Four futures: Life after capitalism. Verso.

Friedman, M. (2002). Capitalism and freedom. University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1962)

Fuchs, C. (2014). Social media: A critical introduction. Sage.

Golumbia, D. (2016). The politics of Bitcoin. University of Minnesota Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). A brief history of neoliberalism. Oxford University Press.

Hayek, F. A. (2007). The road to serfdom. University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1944)

Hess, C., & Ostrom, E. (2006). Understanding knowledge as a commons. MIT Press.

Hjarvard, S. (2008). The mediatization of society. Nordicom Review, 29(2), 105–134.

Jevons, W. S. (2013). The theory of political economy. Palgrave Macmillan. (Original work published 1871).

Kahneman, D. (2013). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kallis, G. (2018). Degrowth. Agenda Publishing.

Kangas, O., Jauhiainen, S., Simanainen, M., & Ylikännö, M. (2019). Evaluation of the Finnish basic income experiment. Reports and Memorandums of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland.

Keynes, J. M. (2016). The general theory of employment, interest, and money. Atlantic Publishers & Dist. (Original work published 1936)

Krause, M. J., & Tolaymat, T. (2018). Quantification of energy use for Bitcoin mining. Nature Sustainability, 1(11), 711–718. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0152-7

Kubiszewski, I., Costanza, R., Franco, C., et al. (2013). Beyond GDP: Measuring and achieving global genuine progress. Ecological Economics, 93, 57–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2013.04.019

Latouche, S. (2009). Farewell to growth. Polity.

Loewenstein, G. (2000). Emotions in economic theory and economic behavior. American Economic Review, 90(2), 426–432. 10.1257/aer.90.2.426

Malthus, T. (2008). An essay on the principle of population. Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1798)

Marx, K. (1990). Capital, Volume I. Penguin. (Original work published 1867)

Mason, P. (2016). Postcapitalism. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Maurer, B., Nelms, T. C., & Swartz, L. (2013). "When perhaps the real problem is money itself!": The practical materiality of Bitcoin. Social Semiotics, 23(2), 261–277. https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2013.777594

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36(2), 176–187. https://doi.org/10.1086/267990

McStay, A. (2018). Emotional AI. Sage.

Mirowski, P. (2013). Never let a serious crisis go to waste. Verso.

Nakamoto, S. (2008). Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system.

Narayanan, A., Bonneau, J., Felten, E., Miller, A., & Goldfeder, S. (2016). Bitcoin and cryptocurrency technologies. Princeton University Press.

Ostrom, E. (1991). Governing the commons. Cambridge University Press.

Peck, J. (2010). Constructions of neoliberal reason. Oxford University Press.

Picard, R. W. (1997). Affective computing. MIT Press.

Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the twenty-first century. Harvard University Press.

Polanyi, K. (1944/2001). The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Beacon Press.

Raworth, K. (2017). Doughnut economics. Chelsea Green.

Ricardo, D. (2016). The principles of political economy and taxation. Martino Fine Books. (Original work published 1817)

Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.

Simon, H. A., Deutsch, K. W. & Shubik, M. (1971). Designing organizations for an information-rich world. Johns Hopkins Press.

Srnicek, N. (2016). Platform Capitalism. Polity Press.

Srnicek, N., & Williams, A. (2015). Inventing the future. Verso.

Smith, A. (2000). The wealth of nations. Modern Library. (Original work published 1776)

Standing, G. (2017). Basic income: And how we can make it happen. Pelican.

Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, & Fitoussi, J. P. (2009). Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress. Paris: OECD.

Streeck, W. (2017). Buying time: The delayed crisis of democratic capitalism. Verso.

Terranova, T. (2012). Attention, economy and the brain. Culture Machine, 13, 1–19.

UNDP. (1990). Human development report. Oxford University Press.

Ura, K., Alkire, S., Zangmo, T., & Wangdi, K. (2012). A short guide to Gross National Happiness Index. Centre for Bhutan Studies.

Van Parijs, P., & Vanderborght, Y. (2019). Basic income: A radical proposal for a free society and a sane economy. Harvard University Press.

Walras, L. (2010). Elements of pure economics. Routledge. (Original work published 1874)

Wu, T. (2016). The attention merchants. Knopf.

Žižek, S. (2010). Living in the end times. Verso.

Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism. PublicAffairs.