

Opening Remarks by Reiko Gotoh (Local Organizer, ANPOSS)

Dear All,

Welcome to Hitotsubashi University in Tokyo! I am Reiko Gotoh, Professor of Economics and Philosophy, chief of *Research Center for Normative Economics* in Institute of Economic Research (IER) and project leader of *Norms, Institute and Mechanism Design* in Hitotsubashi Institute of Advanced Studies (HIAS). We are sincerely honored and excited to be hosting a joint conference of ANPOSS/ENPOSS/PoSS-RT and offering a forum for splendid scholars to come together here, even in a virtual space.

We are heartily grateful to the 15 members of steering committees who conceived and realized today's meeting, as well as to two Japanese Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research: “Towards a Global Standard of Dignity as a Philosophical Concept” and “Construction of <Theory of Capability Justice> Based on Trans-Disciplinary Perspective”.

Hitotsubashi University is a comprehensive university of social sciences and is firmly rooted in the tradition of empirical studies and positive analyses, engaging with real social problems, remaining detached from any authority and power. At the same time, however, it always keeps critical perspectives to reflect on underlying theoretical assumptions, methodological frameworks, and the paradigm in academic community, which tends to become fixed and authoritative.

Drawing on my expertise in economics, the neoclassical economics, which established after the Marginal Revolution in the late 19th century, has been institutionalized as a science by accumulating standardized methodologies both in theoretical and empirical researches. However, I am afraid that the neoclassical economics tends to have left philosophical thinking behind. There remain many social phenomena that cannot be dealt with by the standardized methodological procedures.

At the time of the earthquake of March 11, 2010, I was struck by the sight of a house, which was being rapidly carried away in a river of water, on fire and burning. It was an unbelievable scene but it is a scene that I myself had experienced with my own house. Whether natural or man-made, many of the disasters, while devastating, have a

low probability of occurrence and tend to be dismissed as local and particular, no matter how profoundly true the suffering of those involved.

A new type of coronavirus infection spread like wildfire around the world seems to be different. I could be a passive sufferer, or an active transmitter, or a mere mediator of the virus. The new coronavirus infection seems to have quickly become a universal experience for everyone. However, people know that it has not been universal.

Some individuals have high probability to be hit right over their heads, others are all right just next to them, or rather fortunately increase their gains. It is totally contingent, why it was you and not me or why it was me and not you. Yet, as long as our lives continues, what we have experienced becomes inevitable, whether or not we have accepted the inevitability as a destiny.

Based on the idea of contingency and inevitability, the meaning of methodological individualism in economics has to change. The standard method of neoclassical economics, which focus on the marginal contribution of individual units with the strong assumption of *ceteris paribus* should be reflected upon. Moral ethics of self-responsibility and penal system will also be reflected upon. For example, the fact that, *not I but you* have Covid 19 is a coincidence. It gives a reason that society should assist you with sufficient supports. And, it is also fact that we need to continue living our experiences inevitably, whether or not we have accepted the inevitability of the sufferings.

If economics is also a discipline of institution-building, and if it is not naturalism and intuitionism, but Kant's constructivism, i.e., the alignment of the ideal human being with the ideal institution, then it is necessary to know what a human being is.

Both Sharpley's cooperative solution and Marx's theory of exploitation are "distribution according to contribution. On the other hand, it was Professor Tsuneo Ishikawa who focused on "distribution according to need" and stated as follows. If labor is a fundamental human need (i.e., the desire for freedom), then distribution according to contribution (labor) and distribution according to need coincide. He continues, "If work is an inevitable human need for freedom, then the problem to which society must devote itself is to ensure that all people have the opportunity to work.

I think this is true. But the story doesn't end there, and I'm sure he knew that. The problem of what Keynes called fundamental uncertainty remains in our lives. Keynes said that pleasure implies the absence of pain, but happiness doesn't. Happiness is a concept that is compatible with both pain and tragedy. According to him, unemployment

measures are a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for the possibility that people who cannot escape pain and tragedy can still be happy.

Ten years ago tomorrow, I saw an image of a house in flames flowing down a river. Whether or not someone will suffer a disaster is a coincidence. However, the fact that someone encounters a disaster becomes a necessity (an event unique to the person) for the person who encounters the disaster. The person who encounters the disaster (dead or alive) is forced to accept the experience as his or her own concrete reality. The ruler also tries to confine the disaster as a social identity (unholy or holy) to be worn by a particular individual. Thus, the accidental nature of the disaster is wrapped up deep within the body of the individual, making it invisible to society. Descriptively, Milton Friedman is absolutely correct when he says that not only the effort and will of the individual, but also talent and luck can be attributed to the individual.

However, there is still the issue of society's responsibility here. The question is whether it is normatively correct to attribute chance exclusively to the necessity of a particular individual. Disasters can make ordinary people realize how much they appreciate everyday life. Men who have been stuck in a four-way stupor, unable to bring down their guns, may be flabbergasted by a falling bird and bring down their guns. A disaster may cause us to regard our daily quarrels as trivial, and to solve without difficulty the problem of adjusting multiple equilibria that have been stalled because neither side can yield, even though they really want to cooperate. In other words, disasters can bring value to society at large (more broadly than "positive externalities" in economics), as they contribute to solving people's everyday coordination problems.

Here I see a new combination of need and contribution. An accidental disaster, which may happen to anyone, becomes a necessity or necessity for a particular individual when it is embodied in someone's life and attributed to that person. If the necessity and inevitability of a particular individual can bring value to society at large, then we have an obligation to correctly evaluate the value of a system that does not attribute the cost of the disaster to the individual alone, but rather to the individual who continues to live with his or her own disaster as an inevitability. We have an obligation to give back to this society for the value it has created for us. If we enjoy value but ignore it without giving thanks, we may be treating the people who create value as means to an end. In order to respect those who create value as an end and not as a means to create value, we need to give them proper thanks. This is the concept of public mutuality.

If Dr. Ishikawa had not fallen ill, I would have liked to talk about how distribution according to contribution (labor) is consistent with distribution according to need, given Keynes's problem of fundamental uncertainty, which is a self-defeating assumption.

Again, it is undoubtedly important to accumulate and follow standardized methodological procedures, to be transparent about theoretical assumptions, and to dedicate oneself to holding internally logical consistency. However, we cannot deny the importance of philosophy, which reconfigures research questions, methods and assumptions to deal with real problems to be resolved.

One of the main goals of this conference is to provide a forum for bringing together and exchanging frontier studies of philosophy of social science. I am sincerely looking forward to seeing what kind of academic paradigm will be newly born, which might combine the perspectives of science and possibilities of philosophy.

We are honored to have excellent keynote speakers, including the specialists of Keynesian probability theory, prof. Carabelli, social choice and decision theory, Prof. Weymark, John Rawls' s political and moral theory, Prof. Richardson, and two senior scholars of philosophy of science, Prof. Jarvie and Prof. Noe.

We are pleased to have 30 wonderful presenters, who are selected through the rigorous review process with great efforts of 15 members of steering committees of ANPOSS/ENPOSS/PoSS-RT, and are also pleased to have more than 80 participants, who are kindly interested in and gathering to this joint conference.

Thank you again for coming all the way to Tokyo not physically but virtually. It will be difficult to manage your physical conditions because of the time difference, I am afraid. I would like to express my sincere hope that you can maintain your well-being and health, and enjoy the conference until the last minute of the last day.

Appendix:

This is the main auditorium of Hitotsubashi University, to which we had planned to invite you today.



This is the clock tower, where the library is located.

I hope you can join us for the next four days sitting in the chair in front of this building

