

千葉大学グローバル関係融合研究センター

Center for Relational Studies on Global Crises(CRSGC), Chiba University

千葉大学グローバル関係融合研究センター研究エッセイ



The CRSGC-Chiba Essay/Conference Paper

Report on the International Symposium “Wellness as Fairness”

Masaya Kobayashi and Hikari Ishido

CRSGC-E/C

No.1 28 Feb.2018

Report on the International Symposium “Wellness as Fairness”

**Masaya Kobayashi (Professor, Center for Relational Studies on Global Crises) and
Hikari Ishido (Professor, Center for Relational Studies on Global Crises)**

Abstract:

Chiba Studies on Global Fair Society 4th International Symposium was held on 23 November, 2017 at Chiba University, under the sponsorship of “Chiba University Leading Research Promotion Programme”, and “Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas (research in a proposed research area): Relational Studies on Global Crises”. The main invited speaker was Prof. Isaac Prilleltensky (Miami University), who has actively been conducting research into the issue of wellness and the fairness of the community. This report covers the lectures by Prof. Prilleltensky and Prof. Masaya Kobayashi (Part 1) as well as the panel discussion (Part 2, by experts including Prof. Prilleltensky and Prof. Kobayashi).

Report on the International Symposium “Wellness as Fairness”

Masaya Kobayashi Professor, Center for Relational Studies on Global Crises)
and Hikari Ishido (Professor, Center for Relational Studies on Global Crises)

Introduction

Chiba Studies on Global Fair Society 4th International Symposium was held on 23 November, 2017 at Chiba University, under the sponsorship of “Chiba University Leading Research Promotion Programme”, and “Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas (research in a proposed research area): Relational Studies on Global Crises”. The main invited speaker was Prof. Isaac Prilleltensky (Miami University), who has actively been conducting research into the issue of wellness and the fairness of the community. What kind of community can we say is happy, and happiness and fairness, fairness might sound like a serious word, but what is the relationship between fairness and wellness? We pursued the topic in the symposium. This report covers the lectures by Prof. Prilleltensky and Prof. Masaya Kobayashi (Part 1) as well as the panel discussion (experts including Prof. Prilleltensky and Prof. Kobayashi).

A brief introduction of Prof. Prilleltensky is as follows. He was born in Argentina, and he has worked in Israel, Canada, Australia. His area of interest is well-being for individual community and occupation, and community psychology has developed, and he is an authority in this sector, and also for positive psychology, which is an area which is recently developing also he’s playing an important role. When you say psychology, you tend to think that that is a matter of individual psychology and well-being, but his area is not limited to that but he also considers

community, organization, economy, and the well-being in relation to the organization is also considered, and in that sense, he plays a very important role. We thought that he matters very well with the purpose of our project, so we decided to ask him to come to Japan, and he has received many awards with many important papers. We have also distributed to you a questionnaire. The questionnaire is about positive psychology. The sheet which we have reengineered in our own way, and at the end of that sheet, it talks about the concept that Professor Prilleltensky has developed.

Part 1 (lectures by Prof. Isaac Prilleltensky and Prof. Masaya Kobayashi)

Thank you very much Professor Kobayashi and thank you for all the wonderful reception and for the warm welcome here in Japan and Chiba University. I am very honored and pleased to be here. Thank you so much. My talk is entitled 'Wellness as Fairness,' and first, I would like to share with you an intuition that I have had for many years, which is that justice or fairness must surely play a role in well-being. That's an intuition. But my intuition is accompanied by a fact that not many psychologists studying subjective well-being share my intuition. I seemed for a long time to be in a minority of trying to connect the two, trying to connect the justice with well-being, and in philosophy, the Nobel Prize winner Amartya Sen, an economist, he wrote a very important book a number of years ago called *The Idea of Justice*, in which he asks the question how adequate is the perspective of happiness in judging a person's well-being, which I think is a very important question. We have to understand whether happiness is all of well-being or only a part of well-being, and according to Professor Sen, we can underestimate the importance of happiness in

wellness. In other words, we can ignore or underestimate how big role happiness plays in wellness. We can overestimate the importance of happiness in wellness or we can ignore the limitations of happiness. So it's very important to try to understand what is the rightful place of happiness in wellness and well-being.

In my own estimation, psychology is likely to air on two counts. Number one, overestimating the importance of happiness and well-being. Thinking that happiness is really more important for well-being than it really is, number one, and number two, underestimating the importance of justice in well-being. So, through this presentation, I'm hoping to do justice to the rightful place of happiness and fairness in a person's well-being.

There are reasons why I say that some psychologists ignore the role of justice in happiness or that some psychologists exaggerate a little the role of happiness in well-being.

So for example Professor Seligman in his 2002 book, *Authentic Happiness*, he said and I quote "As far as happiness and life satisfaction are concerned, you needn't bother to do the following. You don't need to worry about making more money, staying healthy, or getting as much education as possible." And in my view, this is an example of overestimating the importance of happiness because through many studies around the world, it was found that people in different social classes report about similar levels of happiness. This in my view does not justify the conclusion that you don't need to make more money or you don't need to worry about staying healthy.

This is a leap of faith because it's paying attention only on one instrument, one survey where people from different backgrounds report similar levels of happiness.

I am going to challenge these assumptions that were made by Professor Seligman, and I also want to challenge these assumptions by another positive psychologist by the name of Sonja Lyubomirsky. Professor Lyubomirsky who does very good research, made in my view, some exaggerated claims saying that about 50% of our happiness is determined by genetics, 40% by our personal motivation, and only 10% by social conditions, and I believe that looking at other sources of data that our happiness and well-being are not only 10% determined by social conditions as I am going to demonstrate. So for example, this is just one of many studies showing that income makes a big difference for well-being. So this is a US-based study, in which people who make more than \$30,000 experience much fewer psychological problems than poorer people. So people who make more money experience fewer stressful incidents, experience less isolation, less depression, and they overall experience more psychological well-being. In a study that I conducted with a representative sample of the US population, my team found also that more income leads to higher overall and psychological levels of well-being. So in my research, we found out that more income does make a positive difference. Also, we concurred with existing research that education also makes a difference for well-being. People with more education tend to experience less degrees of depression, fewer negative events in their lives, and fewer instances of aggressive behavior. So when it comes to aggression, self-efficacy, isolation, negative events, it turns out that people with more education experience

better mental health. We also found out in our own study that more education leads to better physical and economic well-being.

So what is happening then to the claims by Dr. Seligman and Lyubomirsky? I believe that they are extrapolating. They are making a big generalization based on one simple questionnaire. That questionnaire is usually referred to as the life satisfaction or happiness scale. I believe that when you look deeper into people's experience of well-being, you see a more complicated picture. For example here, when you look at the progression of well-being and life satisfaction in Denmark from 1973 to 1998, you can see that the Danish people reported constant improvement in their well-being because social conditions and economic conditions in Denmark continued to improve steadily. Contrary to Denmark, we saw that in Belgium during the similar period of time, people's level of life satisfaction went down and that was related to social conditions, social conditions of ethnic strife within Belgium. If you remember in this period of time, there was a lot of ethnic conflict within the country, and we can see this in a dramatic fashion. So basically, the question here is can the gene pool change in 25 years? The answer is absolutely not. So there is something happening in the social conditions of these societies that are making people happier or unhappier, and as I said, we can see this in a dramatic fashion in Russia during the period of 1981 to 1995 when the percentage of people reporting happiness and life satisfaction went down dramatically. So, if you will remember a little history, the Soviet Union collapsed in 1989 and even though Russia may not have been a great place before, it certainly deteriorated following the collapse of the Soviet economy because there was

no food, you probably remember long lineups in the stores. There was an absence of food and basic services. So, social conditions really matter for well-being.

Can we claim that vodka got into the gene pool? I don't think so. Right? So, it's really we're making a claim here that social conditions are making a big impact in well-being. So, I would like to moderate, temper some of the claims by Professor Seligman and Lyubomirsky by indicating the impact of social conditions on happiness and well-being. So, here we see also that in the United States there is a growing class gap in participation in school-based extracurricular activities. This is another instance where you can see that social classes make a big difference in children's educational opportunities. People with more education are exposed to better extracurricular activities, and here, we can see that there is a growing wealth gap in the United States based on education as well. I could show you data from all over the world with similar results, more income, more education that lead to better well-being.

So, based on this background, on this controversy over what's the rightful role of social conditions, I would like to propose the following two goals. I would like to explicate the role of fairness in wellness at multiple levels because all of these social classes and all of these social conditions that I showed before are not God-given, are not predetermined by nature. These are social conditions created by human beings that can be altered and improved so as we will see as we approach better conditions of fairness, we are going to approach higher conditions of wellness, which is my main argument today. So, after explaining the relationship between wellness and fairness, I

would like to elucidate the psychosocial processes that mediate, that connect between wellness and fairness. So, these are my two goals for today.

So, let's say a few words about well-being, and again, let me be clear that in my view, well-being is bigger than happiness. Happiness is constructed at times as the hedonic aspect of well-being. Hedonism is about pleasure and the pursuit of fun and enjoyment, which is a very important part of well-being, but it's only one part. It's not the whole of well-being. There is a British psychologist and economist by the name of Paul Dolan who claims that well-being consists of pleasure and purpose. Pleasure is hedonic happiness. Purpose is eudaimonic well-being, based on Aristotelian concepts. So, in my view, it's important to balance hedonic with eudaimonic well-being. It is also important to understand that well-being does not reside only in individuals. So, I could ask anyone of you to report your levels of well-being, and you will more or less tell me how satisfied you are with your psychological well-being, with your occupational well-being, and as Professor Kobayashi was saying before, we developed a model of well-being based on six dimensions, interpersonal, community, occupational, physical, psychological, and economic well-being, and we validated the scale, it's called the I COPPE Scale of well-being. Now, it's being also applied in Italy and Turkey, and there is a bit of an effort by Professor Kobayashi to introduce this to the Japanese population. So, it's very important to understand that individual well-being is multidimensional. It's not just one dimension. So, my research team's contribution is to create a multidimensional view of well-being because human beings are very complicated, and you can have high perhaps interpersonal well-being but very low occupational well-being. If you live in a

society where workplace stress is very serious, that may lower your overall life satisfaction, which is a hypothesis I have about something that may be happening in Japanese society. Because a lot of people work very hard, they work really long hours, they cannot disconnect from work, so occupational well-being may be really low, depressing the overall well-being despite for example positive physical well-being. Many Japanese people perhaps report high levels of physical well-being, but they are experiencing low occupational well-being, which tends to depress the overall score of well-being, which is something that we see in Japan. Japan scores very well in terms of objective elements of well-being, for example levels of education, healthcare, economic prosperity, welfare policies. Japan scores very high, but it doesn't score very high in terms of life satisfaction. So, it's very important to understand why the discrepancy and the discrepancy lies in my humble opinion in specific domains of well-being. So, this is why it's important to not just say are you happy, are you unhappy, it's important to pay attention to this unique and specific domains of well-being. So, all of what I said pertains to individual well-being, me asking you or anybody else how are you satisfied with life in different aspects of your existence. But there is more than individual well-being. One can evaluate a relationship in terms of well-being. You can look at a relationship between friends or family members and make a claim that this relationship is healthy or unhealthy. The same can be said for the workplace. Is there workplace well-being? Is there community well-being? These are extra individual dimensions of well-being, and it's very important to think ecologically about well-being, because it's very difficult to thrive and to flourish in a community in the context that is very unhealthy. So my proposal for well-being is to think about systems of well-being. My definition of well-being is a positive state of

affairs in individuals, relationships, organizations, communities, and the natural environment brought about by the satisfaction of objective and subjective needs, and I'm going to explain the difference between objective and subjective needs, which are influenced by different values and different types of fairness. So, this is a multi-layered definition. First, I talked about individual well-being. Now, we're talking about systems of well-being. So, this will become clearer in the following chart. You can see here that we have systems of well-being. We have the individual level, relational level, organizational, communal, and environmental. Some people include, for example, spiritual dimensional. In my view, it is captured under individual, but I think it's a pretty comprehensive system. Some people may want to add a dimension, take away dimension, but overall I think most people would agree that these are key systems of well-being. So, if you take the individual for example, there are objective signs of well-being. So you can experience physical health, you can have good cardiac health, good cardiovascular health, good digestive health, or you can experience objective illness. We can count your cholesterol levels. We can measure your breathing, your oxygen. So there are objective ways to measure physical health, but there are also very importantly subjective signs of well-being. So, for example, people who report high levels of self-efficacy tend to report positive mental health. This is different than in objective sign because it is a subjective report that I feel I am in charge of my life. We call this subjective appraisal, a subjective evaluation. A minus goes to lack of control because we know that people who experience lack of control over their lives tend to report higher levels of mental illness and psychological distress. So, the difference is that here we have objective signs and here we have subjective signs. Subjective signs are personal perception, objectives are measurable

things. I may feel great, but if my cholesterol is 350, it doesn't matter how I feel because really I am very sick in my body. So we have to pay attention to objective and subjective, and here, we see that the big question is what do we need to do to promote efficacy, to promote health, to lower illness, and lower lack of control. Okay, so here we have to enact certain values. Values are principles to guide our behavior. There is a lot of research showing that individual well-being improves when we improve autonomy, when individuals have freedom to behave in ways that are according to their ideals. This is autonomy, freedom, liberty.

Now, what we have here is the opposite of autonomy, lack of power. When people feel oppressed in their lives, oppressed in their families, oppressed in the workplace, oppressed because they have no voice, because they cannot be heard, because they have experiences of invisibility and marginalization and nobody cares. So, this is the antithesis of autonomy. Now, the big question is what is the role of fairness in all of this. Fairness is usually defined as to each his or her 'due .' This is how Professor Michael Sandel from Harvard, and Professor Miller from Oxford express it. This is a well-accepted definition of fairness. To each person, what he or she deserves. In English, we say to each his or her 'due.' In English, your 'due' means what you are entitled to, what you deserve. So, here we are really at the crux of the matter. This is the most important point. Because if I deserve autonomy, I expect to be in relationships when somebody, my parents, my boss, my spouse will provide me autonomy. I don't want to work for a place where I have zero autonomy. If I have zero autonomy, I will experience serious mental health problems. I hope this is clear, and if it's clear, just give me a signal by nodding your head. Yes. Great. Thank you.

Now that we understand how justice impacts the values and how the values dictate behavior to promote efficacy and promote health, now that we understand how the individual system works, we can go to the next level, which is relationships. Now, in relationships, I always have to balance what I am entitled to with what you are entitled to. If I am in a relationship, I want to be fair to the other person. I want to get only what I deserve. If I am in a relationship with my wife, I want the two of us to have more or less equal access to the economic resources of the family. If we have to make a big decision, I want my wife, my son, and I to participate in the decision. Otherwise, it's not fair that just one person makes the decision, and in my life, we made very big decisions. We moved as a family from Israel to Canada to Australia to the United States. We made many transoceanic moves. We made them as a family. So the more people participate in decision-making, the more fairness there is in the relationship. The more fairness, the more we care for one another, the more each person expresses a voice, my point of view, and the more I feel connected to other people. So I hope that you understand that always it starts with fairness. If I respect fairness, if I respect that each party in the relationship needs to participate in the decision, we are going to promote more of the plus signs and reduce some of the minus signs. I'm just going to give one more example. At the organizational level, if I am an employee in an organization where people ask for my participation, the result of my participation is I'm going to feel supported, and if I experience marginality, I'm going to feel isolated. So, if I work in a place that really enacts fairness principles, then it's more likely that I'm going to experience well-being. So, the same can be applied to the other domains. So now that we understand how it works, we can talk a little more in depth about how to make sure that decisions we make in our lives are

based on principles of justice. Justice, as I said before, has been defined to each his or her do. In other words, to each person what he or she deserves.

So, fairness in my view is the practice of justice because people ask me what's the difference between justice and fairness. Justice is an abstract concept. It's a theoretical idea that needs to be translated into practice. So the practice of justice is acting with fairness. According to Professor Sandel, justice means giving people what they deserve, giving each person his or her 'do,' and the question now that you should be asking yourself is how do we ascertain what is 'do' to a person. Do we distribute goods, for example, salary, scholarships, government benefits? How do we distribute goods? Is it based on merit, based on need, based on equality, and I am going to make the argument that we have to distribute goods according to the context of our lives. So, let me make the case. Context should determine what criterion or criteria must be preferred in each case. Context means the situation of our lives, and we all grow up in different conditions of life. We should not apply one principle, one criterion for everybody because we would be blind to the different context of people's lives. So, for example, in social conditions of inequality we must give preference to needs over merit and ability. So, let me explain, if I grow up with a great deal of privilege, but here my friend grows up with a great deal of deprivation, it would be unfair to give me a scholarship if I get better results because I grew up with a lot of privilege. So, if I start life high and my friend starts life low, it would not be fair to say Isaac will always get the scholarship because Isaac got a better grade in school. This would be ignoring where people start in life. Okay, so the context of inequality should accord preference to the needs that people have as opposed to just merit or

hard work. So, inequality would say, let's give benefits for example of healthcare or some welfare support based on needs. This is if we are in a context of inequality, but if we are in a context of relative equality where let's say most of us start life under similar conditions of privilege where the gap between people is not very pronounced, then it's okay to give rewards based on personal effort because most of us start life in a similar situation. But then I happened to be very lazy, but here my friend works really really hard in school. We should be rewarding the person who works very hard because we all had the same opportunities. So, when the opportunities are equal, when we start with the same opportunities, it is okay. It is justified to reward people based on effort, intelligence, and ability. So, in a context of plenty of opportunities for everyone, it is possible that ability and effort will be the preferred choice. So, what is the implication of what I'm saying? Some countries, some communities do not pay attention to context. They ignore context. Therefore, they engage in unfair practices because they are blind to the fact that I started life with privilege and many people did not start life with the same privilege. If there is lack of privilege, if this is a big gap between some people, the first thing we need to do is to provide resources based on needs. Once we reach a certain level of equality, it is perfectly okay and justified to pay more money, to give more rewards, to give more scholarships to people who excel in life. In the United States, there is a dogmatic view that you always need to use merit and effort as the only criterion to reward people. That is not a just policy. It's a dogmatic policy. It says *merit* no matter what the context of your life is. So, I'm making the point that context must play a role in how we distribute resources in society.

Now, let me talk for a minute about the two most important aspects of fairness, which are distributive and procedural justice. Distributive is what we call the 'what' of justice. 'What' is an outcome. So, for example what piece of the pie do you get? Let's say that in your family, your monthly income is ¥100,000, and after you pay your rent and after you pay your bills, how much money is left and how do people use it. Does the father use the money for alcohol or do we distribute the money in a way that benefits everybody? Right? So, this is the 'what.' What do we distribute? Now, this is called distributive justice. How do we distribute a good? This is important but no less important is procedural justice. Procedural justice is about how justice is practiced, how decisions are made. If you work for an organization where decisions are made and you are never consulted, your opinion does not count. If you live in a society where there is a lot of gender-based discrimination, and women are not asked for their opinions. Women do not participate in social decision-making. They will feel excluded from decision-making. So, we're talking about both types of justice. People are very sensitive to what piece of the pie they get, but also they are very sensitive to participating, having a voice in decisions being made. So, what we can see here is that at the top of this sphere are the different domains of well-being, interpersonal, community, occupational, physical, psychological, and economic well-being, and in relationships, we expect human beings want to expect distributive justice. If I make X amount of money and I contribute X amount of effort, I want to be entitled to a piece of the pie. Not only do I want to be entitled to a piece of the pie, I also want to have a say in how we make decisions in my relationship. I don't want always to go to the movies that my wife wants to go. Sometimes, I want to have a say as to what decisions we make in my family. This is part of procedural justice, and

when you combine and apply distributive and procedural justice, for example, to develop mental areas, there are cases of child abuse and elder abuse where elderly people are abused because they don't have the developmental faculties to make decisions in their lives. So, around the world, there are many cases where children abuse their parents. They take their money or where parents abuse their children. There is sexual abuse. So, in sexual abuse and in cases of developmental abuse, there is a violation of distributive and procedural justice. The same happens in organizations where we see lack of transparency in organizations, decisions are made where you do not participate, and the research says that lack of transparency becomes informational injustice. When there is lack of informational justice, employees become very disengaged. You become disengaged, you want to quit your job. So, as you can see, the same can happen at the community level where we have procedural and distributive justice, and for example, there is cultural justice. Cultural justice means regardless of your ethnic, linguistic, gender background, your sexual or gender orientation, you will experience this same type of justice as anybody else. When you do not experience because of your gender or because of your ethnic background where you do not experience the same type of access to resources or where you are not consulted, where you are marginalized, there is lack of cultural justice, and as a result, the top sphere, which is the wellness part, is going to suffer. So, there is a very basic premise here. Everything that happens in the blue side of the sphere is going to impact everything that's happening on the brown side of the sphere, and I am going to give you just one example at the macro level, and here, we can see that when there is economic inequality, countries experience more problems. If we take the case of low economic inequality, when there is low inequality, countries experience fewer health

and social problems. So, this is an index of health and social problems based on mental illness, trust, crime, infant mortality, life expectancy. When you average all of these and you create an index, you can see that countries like Japan, Sweden, and Norway perform very well. I point to Canada, Australia, and the United States because these are the countries where I've lived, and according to this graph, I'm not making very smart decisions because I moved from Canada to Australia and then to the United States, which doesn't have a very good record for health and social conditions, but it's interesting – let me just keep this slide. I just want to show that relative deprivation really matters all over the world. So, even in wealthy countries like Sweden, people with more education, they report fewer cases of premature mortality. So, what you see here is that even in countries that are well endowed like Sweden where there is a lot of welfare support for the population, very good social policies, very high on human development index, people with a doctorate usually experience lower rates of premature mortality than people with higher tertiary, secondary, vocational, et cetera. So, really when people compare themselves to other people with more education, they feel a subjective difference that is going to impact their level of control over their life. So, the same happens in England, and I just want to show that based on a German index of social justice, we were able to compare countries on the basis of poverty reduction, health, welfare, access to education, and this German-based index provided us an opportunity to compare countries around the world. So, here you have the horizontal axis is social justice and the vertical axis is life satisfaction. So, you can see here that Norway, Sweden, Denmark, they tend to perform very well because they are high on social justice, and they are relatively high on life satisfaction. Now, here we see interestingly enough that Japan is sort of in the

middle of the pack where there are a good amount of social justice policies, but people do not report very high levels of life satisfaction, and one can hypothesize that perhaps this has a lot to do with workplace stress or perhaps a culture that places a lot of stress on individuals to fulfil certain roles that are very prescribed in the culture, perhaps rigid expectations that judge people harshly, so people feel I'm not living up to my cultural expectations. That may depress the level of life satisfaction. So, let me now talk a little bit about what social processes mediate between wellness and fairness, and this is the concept of mattering.

For me, mattering is the concept that means I am important in life. I matter. I can make a difference. So, this is a very important construct in psychology which consists of two important elements, feeling valued, and adding value. Feeling valued means I feel recognized. When I walk into a room, people pay attention to me. I feel that I am somebody. I do not feel ignored. I do not feel invisible in this group, family, or society. This is only half of the equation of mattering. The second half of the equation is adding value. I have to contribute to myself and other people; otherwise, I do not feel that I really matter in this world. So, there are really three sources of feeling valued. I can feel valued by my relationships, the community where I live, and I can feel valued by myself. So, if I experience feeling valued here, these arrows show I am going to benefit from a positive self-esteem, and if I add the value to my friends and my co-workers and family and if I add value to the community, I am going to feel like I am adding value also to myself. So, we can see that in the next slide the sources of feeling valued and adding value have a lot to do with wellness and fairness. I am just going to give you an example. Here, we see that self-esteem, self-

acceptance, and self-care are both aspects of feeling good but are also aspects of fairness. In relationships, I want to experience social support, which is an aspect of wellness, but I also want to experience respect, which is an aspect of fairness. So, every factor in this diagram has to do with wellness and fairness. These are two important contributors to mattering. Now, there are threats to mattering. There are threats to feeling valued. I can feel invisible. I can feel that I am marginalized, and usually, this happens because some other group or person in the surroundings is feeling very entitled, and there is a threat to adding value, which derives from feeling helpless. I try to make a difference in my lives, but I never succeed. As a result, I feel helpless, which is highly correlated with depression and many other psychological problems. So, this usually happens when I am trying to make a difference in life, but there is an autocrat or a dictator in my family or at work or in government who doesn't want to change anything. So, as a result of dictators, we feel helpless. So I'm going to conclude just by showing how monkeys react when they feel that there is no fairness in their relationships. You are going to see a quick video about how Professor Frans de Waal, who is a primatologist, works with monkeys. So, listen to his explanation.

[Video viewing]

Final experiment that I want to mention to you is our fairness study, and this became a very famous study and there's now many more because after we did this about 10 years ago, it became very well known, and we did that originally with capuchin monkeys. I'm going to show you the first experiment that we did. It has now been

done with dogs and with birds and with chimpanzees. With Sarah Brosnan, we started out with capuchin monkeys. What we did is we put two capuchin monkeys side by side. Again, these animals, they live in a group, they know each other, we take them out of the group, put them in a test chamber, and there is a very simple task that they need to do, and if you give both cucumber for the task, the two monkeys side by side, they are perfectly willing to do these 25 times in a row. Cucumber, even though it's only water in my opinion, but cucumber is perfectly for them. Now, if you give them grapes – the food preferences of my capuchin monkeys correspond exactly with the prices in the supermarket, and so if you give them grapes as a far better food, then you create inequity between them. That's the experiment we did. Recently, we videotaped it with new monkeys who had never done the task thinking that maybe they would have a stronger reaction and that turned out to be right. The one on the left is a monkey who gets cucumber. The one on the right is the one who gets grapes. The one who gets cucumber noted the first piece of cucumber is perfectly fine. The first piece he eats. Then, she sees the other one getting grape and you will see what happens. She gives a rock to us. That's the task, and we give her a piece of cucumber, and she eats it. The other one needs to give a rock to us and that's what she does, and she gets a grape, and she eats it. The other one sees that. She gives a rock to us. Now, gets again cucumber. She tests the rock now against the wall. She needs to give it to us, and she gets cucumber again. So, this is basically the Wall Street protest that you see here.

Isaac Prilleltensky

I just want to make the point that the example with the monkeys happens all over the world in relationships between people, in organizations, and in communities where certain people experience lack of fairness because they provide something, but they do not get what they deserve in return. Every time we feel there is lack of fairness in relationships, in the workplace, in the community, we tend to accumulate aggression that one way or another it's going to come out in very uncontrolled, negative, destructive ways. If we want to prevent aggression and if we want to prevent destructive tendencies in monkeys and in people, we have to create relationships, workplaces, and communities where there is a good amount of distributive and procedural fairness. .

Hikari ishido

As you have listened Wellness as Fairness, that concept was discussed in easy-to-understand level, how can there be a wellness in the community. In this flier, there was a sphere and that sphere is the summary of this Wellness as Fairness. In a systematic way, it was discussed when people feel that there is wellness and fairness and when people feel that there is no fairness and how that relates to happiness in the society. Professor Prilleltensky gave us lecture in very systematic way. He kindly shared with us his latest research.

Masaya Kobayashi

Professor Prilleltensky' presentation was a very clear, insightful presentation, and as you I'm sure have understood, usually the audience are more interested in social science and probably many of you are not so familiar with psychology, so from my

side, I would like to discuss the background. To give you a background, I would like to discuss psychology and how my research topic 'Communitarianism' relates to positive psychology. I was thinking of how his lecture and my lecture relates, so I would also like to discuss the relationship between the research by Professor Prilleltensky and myself. I do research on public philosophy, and at graduate school, public philosophy research is one of the pillars in the research, and one of the representative researcher in public philosophy is Professor Michael Sandel, public philosophy studies these aspects that is it serves as guidelines for behavior and is shared by many people, and in Japan, we are trying to distinguish between public and civic. Public usually means states and common. Common means being together with the other people, communal, community. So, from the sense of common, community and communal will be very important as concepts, and justice was discussed by Professor Prilleltensky. When we discussed political philosophy, justice is a very important concept, but when we think about justice as representative thoughts, there are three lines of thoughts or three philosophies. First is utilitarianism type of philosophy, for a maximum number of people to have maximum happiness and this is basically seen often in economic thoughts, and second is liberty type of justice. This is mainly about legal rights and a choice for individuals. And thirdly, I call virtue type of justice is about virtue and goodness. It is ethical and this ethical justice should also be emphasized in political discussion. So, this is how justice in political philosophy can be classified, and in this, the liberty type of justice can further be classified into two categories, one of which is libertarianism. Often, it is also called neoliberalism or similar to neoliberalism. Individual property and property rights are considered rightful and economic deregulation, small government privatization,

libertarianism, concept is related to these policies as well. On the other hand, John Rawls argued that there should be egalitarian liberalism so that there will not be too much gap, but at the same time, growth should be achieved and this is known as a concept that supports welfare state, and in any event in both cases, individual choice is emphasized, and in the midst of various values, rights are seen as important. So, what rights are seen as important that there is a difference between libertarianism and liberalism. In libertarianism, ownership is considered important, so it's against the welfare and in more egalitarian liberalism, welfare rights, social rights are considered more important. So, it supports welfare state.

As Professor Prilleltensky mentioned, economic issues, the disparity, fairness, and parity deprivation, these are seen as more important in liberal thinking. Now, as for virtue justice, this is oftentimes called communitarianism, and there are two important components, one is good life, emphasis on good life, and when we think about justice, good life is important, and secondly, individual freedom but not just individual but people are living together and thinking together, so commoners is also considered important. Michael Sandel is known as a foremost advocate of communitarianism, and he says that self exists within a context, and there is encumbrance. So, there is encumbered self, but communitarianism is distinguished from extreme nationalism, statism, or conservatism on the right. So, I think we should call it liberal communitarianism, to distinguish between extreme right as statism and conservatism, and these are some of the representative thoughts regarding justice in philosophy, and how does the notion of justice relate to psychology. Conventional psychology was more focused on negative state of mental health. People who have mental diseases

and to treat them with the focus. However, since around 2000, positive psychology emerged. Earlier, Martin Seligman's name was mentioned, and when Seligman was president of American Society of Psychology, positive psychology was proposed by Seligman. It has been more than 10 years since then, and it has taken rapid traction and to look at people in positive psychological state. People in certain psychological state will make people healthier and more thriving. Such tendencies were observed in various surveys and results, and in this psychology, there are three domains, according to Seligman. First is subjective emotion. Second is individual traits, and the third is institutions including work or organizations.

So, there are three domains in positive psychology, but most of the research had focused on the first and the second, and there has not been much focus on institutional aspect of the positive psychology. Two years ago, since the World Congress two years ago, the third aspect especially society and fairness are now emphasized in positive psychology, and at the time that I began to take interest in positive psychology was exactly at this time, and in University of Pennsylvania, there is a positive psychology center. I visited the center, and I declared that I took interest in positive psychology, but macroeconomy, community politics, is there any research on the relationship between the two, and director of the center introduced me to writings by Professor Prilleltensky and also pointed me towards the graduate school research, and then I read books by Professor Prilleltensky and was deeply impressed and decided to introduce his work in Japan and also wanted to pursue this research in Japan, and we were able to invite Professor Prilleltensky. We are grateful that he kindly agreed to come.

Now, positive psychology and public philosophy, how are the two related? Earlier, I mentioned that there is a utilitarianism type of justice, and there are researchers who consider positive psychology public philosophy based on the focus on utilitarianism, but I think it's more related to virtue type of justice. The reason for saying this is that at the time when positive psychology started, and in the background the research of happiness existed, and here subjective well-being was studied with the various indicators, and health and work and performance, the relationship thereof and correlation thereof were studied. In the beginning of the positive psychology, subjective well-being is something that is felt by persons subjectively. There was also some discussion of subjective well-being by Professor Prilleltensky earlier, and this is hedonism and pleasure. It's like thoughts that places emphasis on hedonism and pleasure, and so these researchers called this hedonic psychology one time, and as opposed to that, many people objected to the notion of hedonic psychology. The true happiness of people and in academia, oftentimes the word used is well-being, and rather than superficial hedonism, there is something more in-depth that is involved. Aristotle, the Greek philosopher, used the word eudaimonia. This is like mental happiness, and Aristotle said that according to individual virtue and when individuals behave based on that virtue, there will be authentic happiness, and based on this notion, eudaimonic well-being is the word used. In order to measure eudaimonic well-being, researchers developed indicators and various researches were conducted, so between hedonic psychology and eudaimonic well-being study, there was much debate, and according to what I have reviewed, the conclusion is that both are effective indicators and both are important; however, regarding pleasure or hedonic

pleasure, subjective well-being may be a better measure, and for self-realization, eudaimonic-based indicator may be better correlated. Both can be effective but both are different and as Professor Prilleltensky mentioned, both are meaningful, but eudaimonia is happiness more in-depth, and I think more people are coming to realize the importance of eudaimonic happiness. Those who follow Seligman theory also aware of this and are developing new research and positive emotion, emergence, and meaning and relationship and achievement in these five dimensions, well-being is to be measured.

Earlier, there was a discussion by Professor Prilleltensky. A relationship is very important in the sense of happiness and there is much that overlaps with what Professor Prilleltensky discussed, so there is questionnaire one, it says version three. The paper is distributed to you, and this is actually based on perma developed Seligman's group, and we modified it slightly. This is a questionnaire that we used, and for your information, this is the questionnaire that we used to try to survey happiness.

How did the debate develop? My understanding is that initially, it was like utilitarianism, and well-being discussion started with hedonic well-being discussion and then it went through Aristotelian classical discussion. I think positive psychology is coming closer to the more classical notion by Aristotle. We have to look not only at subjective well-being, but objective well-being. There was also discussion by Professor Prilleltensky of subjective and objective well-being, and I believe that positive psychology is now moving to cover objective well-being as well. So,

Aristotleian type of empirical science is now being included by positive psychology. My understanding is that this is how we can interpret positive psychology and then this is quite like communitarianism in the political philosophy. As I mentioned earlier in the case of communitarianism, there is the element of good life and there is also the element of commonness, and new Aristotle principle is the word used by Professor Sandel, and so classical notion under Aristotle felt that is more emphasized in communitarianism, and the psychology center director said eudaimonic turn – it's a phrase he emphasizes – eudaimonic turn and commonness as for the commonness element, for example Professor Keyes discusses social well-being. He focuses on social well-being in developing his indicators had been quite impactful, and Professor Prilleltensky is looking at not only individual but interpersonal and organizational and community level well-being including community well-being. So, commonness is now being emphasized in the psychology research area in the emerging psychology area as well. The communitarianism concept is also very well reflected in the research in psychology.

Community psychology is a sector of psychology, and Professor Prilleltensky is one of the authorities of the sector. Social psychology places importance on personal or individual psychology and society, but community psychology is macro level, so diseases or wellness development in the community is considered and the impact of the community on environment of psychological state of individual is considered not only from the micro point of view but the macro point of view is also researched. And I recently became aware of this type of psychology and your projects as well. We have placed importance of community, so community research or community

psychology are closely related. That's how I wanted to have his presentation here today, and having said so in community psychology, individual skills are taught and there is a lot of research supporting small groups, but the word new community psychology is used by Professor Prilleltensky that there should be consideration of justice and equality, so critical community psychology as is mentioned. Individual organization, community, interdependence, human relations, these are the aspects that should consider in thinking of the multilateral well-being using the measure, I have distributed to you the third research paper, and I have also added the Japanese version to the paper, and from the political science point of view, there is further contact with political science. For instance, under political repression or economic exploitation, this is not used very much in the usual psychology, but in the new community psychology, that gives a big impact on human well-being, so not only skill to raise individual well-being but there should be macro perspective to enhance well-being. Critical is also a bit stressed. Such an awareness, experience, and action is also considered. The new community psychology issues, I believe that in area of political psychology is total libertarian or a new community psychology.

Definition of justice was mentioned earlier, and Michael Sandel very well-known definitions are used, so I could understand well the commonality. The communitarian type of awareness of the issue, I think that is also shown in the concept of justice, the definition of Michael Sandel, the concept of deserve or to be 'do' was also mentioned in the presentation and also procedural justice. The issue stressed by liberal was also mentioned in the presentation. The liberal, when you're thinking communitarian way of thinking at the issue, both I think were included in the previous presentation. In

that sense, liberal communitarianism should be close awareness and that is how I understood his presentation.

Who do we have to think of such issues? Even if individuals work hard to be happy, it might be difficult because there are many social problems, and it is a common sense in the economics like war, dictatorship, economic downturn, and injustice and wealth gap, so disease is important concept in the area of healthcare and that would be an unsound society if low level of happiness. To make a sound society, not only individual psychology but there must be a more macro level. Macro psychology should be one aspect of positive community psychology. That is my feeling about that. From that perspective, what you're talking today is very important, and among the likings of Professor Prilleltensky, there was not much writing focused on Japan, but today he referred to the case of Japan with empirical data. I was listening to a previous presentation, and my impression was that in Japan for instance, in terms of sanitation or health, in objective items, the score is very high. In that sense, we can say that well-being might be high in Japan, but on the other hand, social justice, and politics is low in Japan, and as a result, well-being is also not that high, so the Japanese society's positive aspect that is highly evaluated and the problems both can be seen from both objective and subjective means and that was clearly shown. Having this awareness about the issues and when thinking about a problem of individual and society from a psychological perspective, it might be positive to think more from a psychological perspective, and this is public psychology of having pursuing and for the development, this might be very important. The liberal awareness of the problems maybe issues related to the society. Negative issues like

repressional human race, how to prevent and how to cope with that is important, and the positive awareness of issues like encouragement or enhancement, to enhance or encourage something, such positive way of thinking is also important in social science. To be happy and healthy and to make such a society, both elements must be considered in the area of the new social science. And lastly, as a good opportunity, I have two questions to Professor Prilleltensky. One, as was mentioned in his presentation, it is very shocking for many positive psychologists that many major series is mentioned that not to think about happiness but the environmental factors, our contacts are important, and therefore, the economic situation also influences happiness and that is being stressed by data. In particular, international comparison, you have compared inside the company, which he said is very influential. From a social scientific point of view, this maybe obvious, but in various psychology, this discussion has been had with the background, there is installing paradox, if the economy grows for a certain extent, then economic growth will influence the happiness. If you're very poor, then happiness is low, but if the economy grows to a certain extent, if income raises beyond certain level, the level of happiness does not enhance that much, so the level of enhancement of happiness is lower than it was previously. From that perspective, psychologists believe that environmental factors and economic factors but rather than that psychological factors were stressed. But against that, he mentioned a very important point, the installing paradox, how should you think about that relationship. That's the first point. That's my question. How to consider this paradox, and my second point, I'm an expert of political philosophy. In the multidimensional well-being, you also talk about economic dimension, and you didn't mention about the politics. You mentioned possibility of spiritual well-being,

but political well-being was not mentioned. That was my impression from your presentation. Of course, in your presentation, you mentioned about elements of later politics like injustice or liberalization, but in terms of politics, what are your views. Is it necessary to use politics as an indicator as we have distributed in the Japanese version? We discussed about it, economic well-being – not only economic well-being but political well-being is also being included in this indicator, so we have included politics in the Japanese version, so I would like to ask for your views on that. .

Hikari Ishido

From Professor Kobayashi, there was also a mention of Professor Seligman, and Professor Prilleltensky's books were also discussed, and I think you could understand the background of why this symposium was organized, and from positive psychology perspective, two questions proposed to Professor Isaac Prilleltensky. There were two questions from Professor Kobayashi, and then we have four active researchers in Japan from different disciplines who will be giving comments on the lectures, and we would like to have a more in-depth discussion.

Part 2 (panel discussion among experts including Prof. Isaac Prilleltensky and Prof.Masaya Kobayashi)

Masaya Kobayashi

Yesterday, Professor Prilleltensky gave a lecture to mostly students, and the students responded very well. And through that process we had some discussion between Professor Prilleltensky and myself. This year, in Montreal, at Canada, there was an

International Positive Psychology Congress, and based on the presentation that I made at the Congress, I wrote a paper and Professor Prilleltensky gave a very useful comment on that paper, so it may be better to tabulate for the sake of psychologists, who may not be good at following details, so this is a matrix that I produced as a result.

I don't have much time to elaborate on this but this is for your reference. And last one is Prima and other research results. This is the preliminary research result and student performance, student participation, there is a correlation. Still I'm not sure why correlation is negative but we have started to do more research on this. Now I would like to introduce our commentators.

First commentator is Professor Kazuo Tsubota from Graduate School of Medicine, Keio University. Professor Tsubota introduced positive psychology to Japan. He was the first to introduce positive psychology in Japan and we have a Positive Psychology Medical Society in Japan. There is only academic society, Positive Psychology Medical Society, and even I, as a social scientist, am participating in that society.

Kazuo Tsubota

This is my first time to learn about justice and happiness or wellbeing, so very nice education. Recently, I have read a very interesting book about Moral Tribes, you may know that book. That book describes the importance of morals, and I was very convinced that morality is very related to wellbeing or happiness. And morality is very related to the society. For example, one good thing in one society may be very

bad thing from the moral point of view in one or the other society. I have a question, to just make my mind very clear, so what is the relationship between justice and morality?

Isaac Prilleltensky

Justice is one aspect of the moral life of a community. So if you think about what constitutes the moral life of a community, there are more values than just the value of justice. I happen to believe that there is a hierarchy of values in which, in my mind, justice is one of the most important values. So, for example, autonomy and freedom are important values. I think societies that give citizens freedom to choose to move, to change jobs, to study what they want, uphold freedom and freedom is an important value. I think, caring and compassion is another important value. So, in my mind, how we distribute freedom, caring, compassion, inclusion of other people, diversity and other important values, such as participation in society, belonging, in my mind all these values are important but secondary to the value of justice because if I think that you don't deserve freedom, my implicit notion, I must have an idea of justice that says professor Tsubota does not deserve freedom. So other philosophers and social scientists can disagree with me, but I believe that a good society should have a balance between three kinds of values, individual values, for example, freedom and autonomy; another kind of value is fairness and social justice. I call these communal values, and the third kind is relational values, which is basically about how we get along in society, how we resolve conflict, how we care for one another. So, there are individual, relational and communal values. I believe that every society distributes

these values in different ways. So, in my view we need all of these values but I think in hierarchy. I think justice is the most important.

Kazuo Tsubota

Since I'm a doctor and biologist, my standard view is the most important thing for the human as well as to the creature, is the survival. These values, including justice, should be for the increase in survival ratio, that is my view. In that case, do you think, having a justice concept contributes to the better survival of the creatures, including human?

Issac Prilleltensky

Absolutely yes, because I think that lack of justice, as we saw in the case of monkeys, leads to aggression, and lack of justice leads to destruction. We see these in interpersonal relations, but we also see this across tribes, and across nations, across groups. Usually, the best way to maintain peace is to provide justice, so that every person or group feels, I got a piece of the pie that is more or less commensurate, in alignment with what I deserve, so I see justice as the prevention of war. Therefore, is very important for the survival of the species.

Kazuo Tsubota

I was very shocked by the movie that you have shown me, the monkey movie, that behavior is determined, of course, you are saying that it is by the justice value, by that behavior is determined by the monkey's genetics, or the monkey's learning in the past maybe 10 to 15 years of history, how do you think?

Isaac Prilleltensky

There is some work in social neuropsychology that recognizes certain areas of the brain, that light up when people and monkeys experience lack of fairness. There is a theory in neuropsychology that the experience of physical pain is similar in the brain to the experience of psychological pain caused by lack of fairness or rejection or ostracism. I think there is evidence, neurological evidence, that people respond to interpersonal pain in lack of fairness, in ways that the brain thinks, is same as physical pain. There are I believe, biological reasons that make us very angry, when we are experiencing a social rejection or marginalization.

Kazuo Tsubota

You think that this neurological pathway is determined by the brain cell, by the genetics or the brain?

Isaac Prilleltensky

I think that there is an interaction between interpersonal behavior and how the brain reads that.

Kazuo Tsubota

That's very clear. You know the feeling of pain increases the survival ratio because if it is hot we have to avoid. Same thing, you are providing that, if you have some strange thing in the society, our brain feels pain, so maybe avoid, and this avoidance may increase our survival ratio.

Isaac Prilleltensky

Up to a point, because we know from psychology that if you harbor, if you have so much pent up anger, if you don't have a decent way of communicating your frustration, eventually your frustration will come out in uncontrollable very aggressive ways.

Kazuo Tsubota

It's very interesting, in the pain field the new concept of neuropathic pain or the chronic pain or uncontrollable pain. The pain itself is the mandatory thing and is a natural thing, but if the pain itself goes beyond a certain level it's very bad for us, so same thing applicable to the concept of justice so too much justice or too much reaction to the justice might not be a good idea.

Isaac Prilleltensky

Right, so there is another important concept in psychology of self-regulation. If you look at me, I think in a funny way, that I don't like, if I don't have very good self-regulation, I may decide to hate you or to swear at you, or to say, you are not fair. So, we all require self-regulation which is a function of the prefrontal cortex, to control our behavior. Now, if it is a minor infraction, if you push me by mistake, I should be able to control my reaction. But if I am the subject of injustice, day in and day out, day in and day out, eventually I have to do something. Because if I try to control it, eventually, I will either develop a psychosomatic disease, or I will respond in very violent ways. So, I think, people who are paranoid, they have very poor self-

regulation. So, if I think that you look at me funny, I may punch you in the face, so that's a problem of self-regulation. So, we should all control our behavior but again, in certain context, it's not functional, it's not adaptive to continue suffering from oppression because eventually I am about to give up my freedom and my ability to reproduce.

Masaya Kobayashi

As a summation the positive psychology is an area of healthcare, well there is a website about the subject, hope we will have more discussions on the subject. If you are interested in positive psychology please participate in that group. And we have received comments, different comments from different sectors.

The second commentator is Ms. Miki Akiyama from the Tokyo Healthcare University. She is an associate professor at Tokyo Healthcare University. She is well versed with psychology including positive psychology, so Professor Akiyama please.

Miki Akiyama

I'm with Tokyo Healthcare University. I'm also a researcher at System Design and Management Research Institute of Graduate School, Keio University.

I would like to discuss, self-compassion and wellbeing of a career, a person who provides care. And after my brief presentation, I would like to ask some questions.

Persons who provides care, carer, when I was in graduate school, I was studying Quality of Life for family of caregivers, and now as a profession, there are care-givers

profession such as nurses, and now I'm studying self-compassion of nurses as professional caregivers, I would like to first discuss my background and then I would like to ask questions to Professor Prilleltensky.

We in the nursing profession are caring for the patients is first and foremost, putting ourselves the second after patients, dedication to the patient was emphasized in the education, in the past. This means that, the nurses have to sacrifice themselves to dedicate themselves to the patients and this led to a very large turnover and difficulty of retaining nurses, and I think there is going to be a serious problem of shortage of nursing profession in the future. There are many problems that nurses' face including very demanding work conditions, but mental and psychological issues that nurses face every day are also very important. There is compassion fatigue and this is a very serious problem for nurses. Compassion fatigue leads to deteriorated work performance, and it also leads to nurses leaving the work. To prevent such fatigue from compassion, we are thinking about self-compassion. We believe that it is necessary for us to have compassion for ourselves. With our self-compassion we can recharge our energy and will not be exhausted by caring for others.

So, with self-compassion, I believe that we can recharge energy, and self-compassion was advocated by Kristin Neff, a US researcher and there are three components, one of which is kindness to oneself, and the other is common humanity . Professor Prilleltensky's speech reminded me that fairness and justice may be related to common humanity. We have a sense of being connected to others, as we live as a

human being. I felt that there's a relevance here with justice and fairness. And the third component of self-compassion is mindfulness.

Mindfulness, this was not known very much in Japan, and mindfulness was considered synonymous with meditation, which is somewhat understood as bogus, but mindfulness is now better understood and there is evidence for mindfulness as well. And so, mindfulness, kindness to oneself, and common humanity are the three components of self-compassion. Nurses are working by providing care, compassion, kindness and with self-compassion, nurses can reenergize themselves and will do loving-kindness meditation.

Before our nurses, I think, for about 680 nurses, I have given courses on loving-kindness meditation. In the past, if there is a patient right in front of you or a student right in front of you, then I would pay attention to that one individual who is in front of me, but I have to face a larger audience, in providing this course of loving-kindness meditation, and facing a larger audience made me think about positive psychology for larger community. And I focused on psychological nursing in my major, and I feel that I would like to be able to care for a larger number of people, and I'm recently more interested in nurse management. I believe I will be able to care for a larger number of people.

Next, about self-compassion and self-esteem. Self-esteem and self-compassion they might sound similar but there is a distinction, not a small distinction but a substantial distinction. In order to maintain mental health, there has to be a self-esteem, high

self-esteem is said to be necessary to maintain mental health or wellbeing, but self-esteem is a feeling of oneself as being good, but this is affected more by how others evaluate oneself, rather than assessment of oneself by oneself.

And there is also healthy self-esteem and unhealthy self-esteem. Healthy self-esteem may be kind words from the family members, and something that one acquires as a result of efforts, but there is also unhealthy way of have a self-esteem, for example, to have a strong ego, and to denigrate others, to feel more powerful by looking down upon others to have a sense of self-esteem, that is an unhealthy way to have a self-esteem.

I would like to pose a related question later, but according to the literature that I read, in the United States in order to enhance self-esteem, people will give education and will say you did well. There was an inflation of academic performance where more students are given A, in order to assist students to have a better self-esteem. And I would like to ask whether, that is truly the case in United States.

I have mentioned that mindfulness was also a component, and mindfulness is not making a judgment, but to focus on here and now. and self-compassion is also not making a judgment, self-compassion is not defining oneself with judgment and evaluation. All of us and each one of us has a strength, but we also have weaknesses at the same time, and we have to affirm that we have both strength and weakness, and that is self-compassion which is different from self-esteem.

In that sense, our question for Professor Prilleltensky is according to the literature that I mentioned earlier, to enhance self-esteem, in order to enhance self-esteem, in the education, students are lauded and commended, this resulted in inflation of student performance, where many students, more students are given A, is that true, grade A? The sphere that was used in the presentation, justice and wellbeing sphere, in the pie, interpersonal justice, relational, will self-compassion fall within this relational in interpersonal? And another question is about mattering self. Self-esteem is mentioned here and here in self-esteem, can self-compassion be included in the same box?

I also have a question for Professor Kobayashi. Is it the right time to ask the question to Professor Kobayashi? Based on altruistic love, volunteering and care, will bring about happiness and will contribute to the public good, but self-compassion, what will be the impact of self-compassion on the community, that is my question for Professor Kobayashi.

Isaac Prilleltensky

Thank you, so the short answer to the question about whether the students in the United States are given high grades to support their self-esteem, I think in general the answer is yes, and I might add that it's the wrong way to improve self-esteem. Self-esteem should be based on realistic feedback of student's effort, and in education it's not a good practice to give incorrect feedback. So, if you give feedback just because you want to be nice to somebody and to give an A, that's a very partial and superficial answer to the problem of self-esteem.

Low self-esteem is the result usually of poor parenting, of social norms in schools that perpetuate bullying, and rejection and marginalization of students. So there is a complex picture of factors that lead to poor self-esteem. The work of Carol Dweck from Stanford University shows that you have to praise people for effort, not for outcome, that's a very important distinction. So, when a student does a good job, you have to praise them because they have invested a lot of work in it. That's more important than the A or B or C that they get on the test, because it basically is telling the student, I appreciate the effort you put in your work, because this is going to lead to what's called a growth mindset. A growth mindset means, if I fail, I can work harder to improve myself, as opposed to saying oh, good boy, good boy, good girl, it doesn't matter what you get on the test. Yes, it does matter. You have to give realistic feedback.

So just to put this thing in social context, I think the US is growing a generation of selfish, entitled young kids because of poor parenting. Parents misunderstand how to raise children, and they think they have to give loving, a lack of limits in order to love your children. So, I think we are facing a crisis of parenting.

Now, with regards to the question of self-compassion, I think self-compassion is a part of intrapersonal justice, justice towards oneself. Very few people are talking about intrapersonal justice. So as a matter of fact I did a very extensive literature review and I couldn't find anything resembling what I'm talking about, other than some psychoanalytic notions of aggression turning inwards. But really very few

people are talking about intrapersonal injustice. I believe it is a serious problem. When people do not have self-compassion, people treat themselves very harshly, which is a problem in depression. So, I believe it's important to define depression, not just in psychological terms but also in ethical and moral terms. Because if I ask any of you, would you treat your neighbor or your family member in denigrating, in derogatory ways, you are probably going to say no, I have to treat my neighbor with respect. But a lot of people who experience depression, they treat themselves in very derogatory ways. So, I believe that self-compassion should be a part of intrapersonal justice.

And you asked also whether self-compassion, where it fits into the mattering model. I think it fits under the self. It's part of self-acceptance. I want to feel valued by myself. If I don't, I'm having a very serious mental health problem, and what happens is that when you do not value yourself, all kinds of negative repercussions take place, because all my energy goes into thinking I'm not a good enough person. Therefore, instead of spending energy to be a good professional, to be a good parent, to be a good friend, to be a good student, all your energy goes into thinking I'm not a good person. So, you have very little mental energy left to function well in other areas of life, work, relationship, community, physical wellbeing. So, this is usually, what happens is we have limited mental energy, and when there is a problem we tend to focus a lot of energy into it, and very little energy goes to something else. And I'm sitting next to a physician so I believe in biology there are similar processes that if you are bleeding, or if there is a virus affecting your body, all the immune system

works towards controlling this aspect, and there is little energy for anything else. Right, so let me ask your opinion on this.

Kazuo Tsubota

I totally agree with you. There was a concept that safety or the security, or the self-confidence, if you don't have such an idea, your brain is working all the time. The default condition, your brain is functioning just for security. I think, there's a certain hypothesis that if you're not secured, you have to pay attention to self-security. It's for the safety issue. One concept is, why if you have friends, your condition is better because if you have friends you feel secure. You have to worry a little less, you don't have to worry too much. Then you have the brain function use for other purposes, like making more money.

Isaac Prilleltensky

Right, yes or being a good athlete or playing the violin, which is why, Abraham Maslow had this hierarchy of needs and security, it's the first one. And if you do not feel secure, you are not going to have enough psychological stamina to invest in flourishing, some people flourish playing the violin, being great athletes, great poets, great artists, and this is a serious problem. In my view, what you just said about self-compassion makes the point that we should incorporate the idea of intrapersonal justice. I think a lot of people with depression can benefit from understanding their condition as being unfair to themselves. I think it's an insight that can help, because then you're not treating yourself just I have a psychiatric problem, but I have a moral problem, about which I can do something.

Masaya Kobayashi

I would like to respond to a question posed to me. Well, Professor Prilleltensky also has written a book on political psychology. In politics, in political science, psychology should be an important aspect. However, after the war, there has been a research on dictatorship in authoritarianism, but other than that, there has not been much study in psychology of healthy people in political science. And I think, what was discussed just now, is closely related or deeply related, there was an earlier discussion about the nurse profession but the same applies to political activists and citizens, people who volunteer, there is a burn out syndrome. They exhaust themselves. If they are passionate it can happen. I myself was engaged in activism, I've seen others who suffer from burnout syndrome. I think for people who are involved in political movement or for specialists and even for ordinary citizens, I think it's important to think about this problem. So the question was, the self-compassion, people who are activists, or civic activists, I think self-compassion could be important. So, there is a method of coping, including meditation, I think these are highly recommended. So, people who are involved in politics, in political science, I think we should spread this concept more widely.

Earlier there was also discussion of mindfulness. This year in International Positive Psychology Congress, I attended two roundtable sessions and there was a discussion about mindfulness and wellbeing. There is much research going on between the relationship, on the relationship between mindfulness and positive psychology. By

the way, we will also be discussing mindfulness and positive psychology for two days, from today.

Now we are moving on to Professor Shintaro Fukushima.

So far, we are hearing about medical care and psychology but now I'd like to move on to the sector of social science. Professor Fukushima is a social scientist and, he studies community and social capital. He did his area of expertise, professor of Fukushima please.

Shintaro Fukushima

I'm Fukushima from Aoyamagakuin University. I have studied cultural psychology and community psychology so I would like to talk from that perspective.

I am thinking of the individual happiness and fairness and integration with social happiness and fairness and the processes, the social process and psychological process. You didn't cover very much of a social gap but social gap as relation with health, I understand your setting about fairness, and social psychological process that is, acceptance and provision of individual value, within the community and human relations. And through that feedback, individual or personal process also takes place.

I'm interested in the moderate level perspective individual and society, community and human relations, so I have questions from these perspectives. I have got four questions, but because of time limitations, I will make the questions, but you can

choose one of those questions. You don't have to answer to all the questions, because of the time limitation.

My first question is about individual wellness or happiness, and mutual relationship are the happiness between oneself and others, how do you take balance between your personal happiness and relationship happiness, of your happiness and others happiness. Is there a key of striking a balance between the two? And my second question is about human relations and individuals, but what do you think of difference between human relations of individual level and community level? And number 3, when you say community, we think of general society, but there is also an individual border, or community border, so how much should we expand that border. So, what is your interpretation of your border of community separating outside and inside? And in an individualistic society like United States, interpersonal social relationship is established but in the case of Japan, in a community-based of society, community or public society is mostly layered by expanding the border of your own community, so which should be the level that we should aim for, should be individual level, social relationship, or should it be that of an extension of your own community?

But because of time limitations I am very fast to explain, but in Japan, we say Japanese community is based on human relations. As you can see, on bottom left, the vertical axis is your own personal wellbeing, the subjective wellbeing or happiness. The vertical axis is the level of happiness of the community. As Japan is a community-based society, if others around you are happy, you feel happy. There is a positive feedback according to the data. But , if people around you are happy,

relatively speaking, you may feel that your value is lower, depending on the nature of the society. Sharpness of this inclination, if others are happy, you feel happy as well, and under what conditions would that happen? I have to analyze that, and individual economic factors, gender, age and individual social relationship is not related, but this inclination gets sharper when there is closer relationship, is one of social capital of the society, community as a whole, when there is a stronger trust in the community, there is a closer relationship between your own happiness and the happiness of other people around you. In a community based society, there seems a stronger correlation.

But on the other hand, as Professor Kobayashi said, in Japan, among the developed countries, community-based society there is a lower level of happiness among the communities. You talked about subjective and objective happiness, and subjective happiness, Japan seems to be ranking lower. But what is your view about the balance between the two? And happiness relationship between your own happiness and other's happiness, in what cases is the closer relationship, individuals with higher happiness, and those with lower subjective happiness, where subjective happiness is lower for individual, this inclination is sharper.

On the other hand, to achieve individual happiness, there is less correlation between other's happiness and your happiness, but when your own subjective happiness is lower, there's a tradeoff that there is a higher correlation between your own happiness and other's happiness. So, as question 1, what is the key to realize close inter-relationship between your own happiness and the happiness between yourself and

others, the balance between the two are important for Japanese and other societies as well, so I'd like to ask for your views about it, that is my question 1.

And related to that, in thinking about it, what we are thinking is that there is multi-layered human relationship. So individual, you need human relationships that is whether you trust others, you may not trust others but all around you are trusting each other, and if you go into such a society, what will happen. There are two layers in society, how will that impact the subjective happiness on health. When you establish a better relationship, you feel happier, but when others around you have a very strong relationship, you feel unhappy. There seems to be two dimensions.

In Japan we talk about ties or bonds in the society, in the community, individual bond or tie could also give a negative impact to your relationship, or to be plays a role of change within a society, so individual level human relationship, and community level human relationship is, I think, it is reported little bit of difference between the two. What is your view about the difference of human relationship on individual level and community level? That is my second question.

I'd like to change the subject, then about the border of the society or a community. You didn't refer to this today, but about a gap among states that is not so related with happiness, but the gap among individuals in a country, if your position is higher, you might feel happier, you may feel that you are having a better wellbeing but if your position in one country is lower you may feel unhappier. It may mean that you might be trying to go to a higher position, that may be one way of looking at that.

On the other hand, according to my data, on individual level, no matter how much economy is developed, there is not such relationship in developed countries, relationship is getting lower. But in Japan, relatively speaking, richer people are happier. We can see inter-relationship correlation in Japan, so if the individuals are in a higher position are not necessarily happy. As not at state level, but if you look at individual level, or school, district level, municipal level, the community level correlations is higher, when you look at the relations in Japan. But at the state level, there is a breaking point, there is no co-relation.

About the border of the community, I think, this could be a hint, and my question is, how should the boundary between the inner side and the outer side of the community be set? This is a very ambiguous question but how should the boundary of a community be set? And about the boundary of a community, one thing we often say is the narrow altruism which is said in biology and evolution, not only one individual, if a group as a whole, people tend to cooperate with a group as a whole, you will be enhanced to a better position. But that may also be a little conflict between groups, so cooperation within a group, inside a group, and conflict between groups maybe in parallel to each other. About a border of a community, Japan is a closed country, and United States is a more open society, where relationships are based on individuals.

So I think that trust between people is important but in Japan and America, I have an impression that Americans, if you meet someone for the first time, they try to establish actively human relationship, so there is a higher choice, but in Japan there is

a strong trust within the group, so there is a strong border between in and out in case of Japan, which leads to my first question, which is should we dissolve the border within inside and outside of the community or Japan is strengthening the border of the community, and is there a way for Japan to develop with such a strong border in the community?

As I had mentioned, I had four questions. First question is what is the key to have a close inter-relationship between individual happiness and happiness of others and your own self? And the second question is, what is your view about the difference individual-based human relationship, and community-based human relationship? And number 3, how should we define the boundary between the inside and outside of a community? What should be the direction of Japan or United States in for? And my fourth question is similar, about such a border, so question 3 and 4 might be the same, so this concludes my question.

Isaac Prilleltensky

Let me try to answer the question about the balance between the relationship between individual wellbeing and other's wellbeing, what's the balance. Let me just offer a comment about something that I think that I know something about, which is how to reach that balance between my wellbeing, and your wellbeing.

I think this is a lifelong learning process that all of us should be teaching our children, and all of us should be learning ourselves, how to have conversations about asserting my needs, expressing my needs for my wellbeing, and how to have a conversation

where I can be a good listener to somebody else's needs for wellbeing. This is not a simple process. I believe that in any dialogue, you need to have certain preconditions to have a fruitful discussion. If you think about a high functioning healthy family, it's a family where there is a dialogue where people feel free to express their views, and at the same time, they allow the other person to express their views. This is at the micro level of the family. A high functioning society is a society where there are opportunities for people to participate in democratic processes to have these conversations. I will just share one piece of empirical evidence.

In Switzerland, there are different cantons, like provinces, small provinces, like prefectures, and in some cantons, in Switzerland, people vote more often than in others. Voting and participating in democratic debate and dialogue is a proxy for having discussion about our common future, and it turns out that in the cantons, where people vote more often, where people participate more in the democratic process, people are healthier and live longer. Which just about one of the best persuasive pieces of evidence to show that when there is procedural fairness, when people have a say, have a voice, there is a better chance to reaching a good balance between what I need and what you need. The short answer is, it's a skill and it's a process that we should be nurturing in our children, schools, in the classroom, in the family, in the community. That's about how to reach that balance, which is one of the most important skills anybody can achieve to lead a fair life. That's question number 1.

The second question that I want to address is about the border. I want to distinguish between a descriptive answer and a prescriptive answer. A descriptive answer about

the border is what borders make a difference for people's wellbeing? That's an empirical question as opposed to a moral question. So, let me answer an empirical question first.

People usually pay attention to people close to them, so if you think of a community as your neighborhood, you compare yourself to your neighbors. If professor Kobayashi lives in my neighborhood and he drives a very expensive car and he tells me that he goes, he flies first class to Europe all the time, and I drive a very poor car and I never go on holidays, and he has a big house, I have a small house, I'm making comparisons with neighbors I know. And this is what the research says, that we experience relative deprivation when we compare ourselves to people in our neighborhood, in our city, in our family. Those comparisons make a difference for wellbeing. In Miami, you have very rich neighborhoods next to very poor neighborhoods, so the people in the poor neighborhoods always compare themselves to the people across the border and they feel really bad about themselves. This is a descriptive answer to the border question.

Now let me answer from a moral point of view, what should be the border? Well, Japan is a very insulated country and from what I can tell, people really like Japan. I don't see a lot of Japanese leaving the country, right? There are many countries where people want to leave because life is very miserable, that's not a case here. You have an asset, you have a high functioning, caring society. No country is perfect, right, so I'm sure Japan has a lot of social challenges, but overall, you have a border,

which seems to me, you like. Then there is the moral question, of what should be the role of countries in helping other countries.

I'm an Australian citizen, I have an Australian passport. I also have a Canadian passport, I also have an American passport, and they are all legal. For example, Canada decided to admit a lot of Syrian refugees. It complicates life for Canadians, makes the life complicated because they have to give them healthcare, welfare, social work, medical care, it's very expensive. Canada decided to open borders. Australia decided to close borders, and Australia sends refugees to an island in the middle of the ocean where people have miserable lives. You know best, what Japan's attitude is towards refugees. These are difficult questions, so I have two passports, a Canadian and an Australian, and I feel prouder about what Canada is doing, than about what Australia is doing. It complicates life, there is no question, but then you have to judge, the cost of complication versus the benefit of the value of compassion and caring, and fairness towards other people. I don't make light, you asked a very serious question.

For example, in the middle of the Syrian refugee crisis, Justin Trudeau, the prime minister of Canada went to the Toronto Pearson Airport, and the Toronto Star created a huge banner in Arabic, saying welcome to Canada. And the Prime Minister Justin Trudeau was at the tarmac welcoming Syrian refugees at the same time when United States was closing the doors on Syrian refugees. Does it make life easy? No. Is it the right moral choice? I think so, so these are very difficult questions, they are just my true sense.

Yoshinori Hiroi

I'm now at the Kokoro Research Center of Kyoto University, so psychology is the mainstream, the main psychologist in this center. And I think it is deeply related to what we are discussing here today. As was mentioned by Professor Prilleltensky, that happiness is related to human psychology, we are already discussing about it, social science, and politics, and economy, or policy making, how to link them together, is a subject that I have always been thinking about. Now, based on what was mentioned by Professor Prilleltensky, Professor Kobayashi, let me try to be brief.

The theme is Happiness Policy Possible. Public policy for happiness is possible or not, is my theme. This is an interesting subject and Professor Kobayashi also talked about the public happiness policy. This has already been taking place. What I'm showing on the slide, some of you may be familiar with the term, GAH. This came from Gross National Happiness, GNH from Bhutan and Arakawa city in Tokyo started this around 2005. This is Gross Arakawa Happiness.

Arakawa city is not only making this as a slogan, but in 6 areas, 46 elements, they made their own unique happiness indicators in many development surveys. In areas where happiness was lacking there were policies developed. As I will talk about later, child poverty was the first subject and social capital of the region, also was implemented as a policy and what was interesting is that it created a Happiness League, under the leadership of Arakawa city. About 100 cities, maybe 95 or 96 cities and towns in Japan joined this movement, and at local government level, they are trying to make happiness indicators and implement policies. This is becoming

very active. And I'm working as an advisor to the Happiness League. I am related to this movement. However, so this is going on but we were always asked a question which is related to today's scene, which is, is it possible to have a happiness policy? There are two major questions that we are often asked, one is that happiness is a very private thing. And the definition may be different depending on the person, so what is happiness is very diverse. And to have policy intervention this may not be desirable, and even if it is possible, this might be limited or restrictive.

And related to that, the second question is that if you were to promote happiness, that is something for the private sector to do. Good example would be Disneyland, I don't know if Disneyland is promoting happiness or not, but that should be left for the companies and markets, it's not something for the public sector to be involved as a public policy. That may not be serving increase in happiness but just be reducing unhappiness because happiness is diverse, but definition of happiness is easier. This is one discussion that was taking place.

Then as a conclusion, as Professor Kobayashi mentioned this may be related to liberalism and communitarian-ism to give you the conclusion first. Happiness policy has a liberal aspect and a communitarian aspect. The liberalism aspect is, as I have mentioned to reduce unhappiness, like for instance, assured access to basic healthcare, reduce poverty. This is, as Professor Prilleltensky mentioned today, wellness and fairness, but on the other hand, in the happiness policy there may be positive aspects that are limited to that, that which is communitarian-ism aspect.

How do you want to develop your own region, your community? A common good or value could be discovered by caring for the local natural environment. And this is relevant particularly at a local level, so this is the communitarian aspect. In Arakawa, as I had mentioned, what was introduced first of all, in the happiness policy, was for child poverty, which is the liberal aspect of happiness policy. And at the same time at Arakawa, this is a place where there is an active local community organization duty like movements to look after the elderly people living alone, so it's an area where there will be very few elderly people living, dying alone. Activities to support the community activity are conducted actively by the local government together with the local president, so this is a communitarian aspect.

The liberal communitarianism is, as professor Kobayashi mentioned, I think, is similar to this. Happiness policy has both liberal and communitarian aspect, and this is my last page that says why does happiness policy has both liberal and communitarian aspect. I think, this is related to the existence of the human being itself that there is, to be community and to be equal are interdependent and mutually complementary. Then why is it so? I believe that human beings, human society, I call it a double nature. There is a community and a larger presence which is the society. Professor Fukushima talked about the border of community, so there is a unit of community and a larger unit of society, so this is a double structure. The smallest unit may be the family, inside and outside of the family, but I think this is related to this. The discussion by Professor Prilleltensky was very related in terms of public policy, so I hope that the happiness policy will be further developed in the future at a local level and global level as well.

I have two questions to Professor Prilleltensky. One, as I mentioned today relations with public policy, what is your view about the relation with public policy? And have you already started discussions about happiness policy like the case I have introduced? That's my first question. And secondly, a question that came up to my mind, by listening to the discussions we are having so far, this is a very grand question, but looking back at the history of human beings, the reality is that on one hand fairness is important, but on the other hand, there is a history of inequality and war and disputes, that is the history of mankind. Based on such a historical perspective, looking at the present, or the future, what is your view of the present and future, based on history? And wellness and fairness to be realized, this may be a very grand question, what should we do to realize wellness as fairness or what should be the contribution to be made by psychology or social science in these areas?

Isaac Prilleltensky

I really appreciate everybody's contributions, this is very enriching, and I really appreciate the opportunity to hear and respond to some thoughts. About the first point whether public policy can be enriched by theories of wellbeing and wellness and fairness, I have a simple answer. The answer is yes, and the answer is both liberal and communitarian interventions need to take place at the same time. If you look at the case of child poverty, which you talk about, it's very important to try to reduce child poverty, which one might say it's a distributive justice problem, but at the same time, one should work with poor children to provide opportunities for personal development. It's not either/or. It's not lets first eliminate child poverty, and then later teach

children how to flourish, how to become great violinist and great artist and great scientist. No. It should happen at the same time, and I believe it is a very important error that is made in policy making, that we treat children in poverty as if they are not quite ready yet to flourish or to develop their talents in other areas of life. What the research shows is that you can have a problem but you don't need to wait until this problem is completely fixed to try to improve the chances of thriving and flourishing in other areas of life. Does that make sense? It's both liberal and communitarian solutions at the same time. That's one.

With respect to the very sad state of affairs in the world, there is history of destruction, I can only quote the Italian communist, Gramsci who said, I am a pessimist of the mind and I am an optimist of the heart. History has turned at times for the better, and I believe that all of us who are trying to improve the world may not live to see the fruits of our labor, but I think in the long term, the world will become a better place because of the cumulative effort of many people trying to make fairer families, fairer communities, fairer workplaces. And unless all these preparatory work takes place, there is nothing to build on, but one contrast, the next generation – this is what happens for example, if you look at the movement of lesbians and gays in the United States, 25 years ago, nobody would have imagined that there would be gay rights, they could marry, they could have benefits for their spouses, so I'm sure that many gays and lesbian people, like Mr. Milk in San Francisco who was killed because of his convictions, 30-40 years ago, many gay and lesbian people would have said, our future is grim, things will never change but because of social movements, for gay and

lesbian rights, today they are enjoying many benefits that weren't imaginable 40 years ago.

My wife has a physical disability, she has muscular dystrophy, she uses a wheelchair. And about 30-40 years ago, also in San Francisco, people with disabilities, with wheelchairs they chained themselves to buses, protesting the lack of access to public transportation. They made a difference that my wife today enjoys, because the United States has a lot of laws that permit people with disabilities to have access to public transportation to buildings etcetera. I could give you more examples on the positive outcomes of social movements, and sometimes we live to see the results and sometimes we don't, but unless people decided to fight, nobody could benefit in the future. I'm ending with an optimistic note.

Questioner A

I have two questions. The first question is about economic growth and its relationship to wellbeing. The other is about "should we not include political wellbeing as part of our scale".

Isaac Prilleltensky

So, I have two points to make, based on the literature. Number 1, the research shows that there is a ceiling effect that above certain amount of money, more money doesn't make you happier. And in the United States, this amount seems to be about \$75,000. The research says, it's very important to make money to satisfy your basic needs, and to experience security. But much more than that, you will be paying a price in other

areas of life. You are going to be working all day, you don't have time for your children, or your family, or to exercise, or to go to the movies, or to relax. That's point number 1. Money is important but it's not everything, and there is a ceiling effect, after which there are diminishing returns. The second point is that the research says that if you have extra money, the best thing you can do with discretionary income is to buy experiences as opposed to buying objects. So, buying another pair of shoes, or the latest Lexus or Toyota it's not going to make you very happy, but if you plan a vacation with your family to nature, you are going to be collecting memories and positive experiences with your loved ones which is the best investment you can do with your money. Okay, that's about economy.

Your question was should we not include political wellbeing as part of our scale? And that's a very good point. We had to make a statistical and methodological decision to keep the number of factors relatively small. When you ask participants to answer very long questionnaires, there is attrition. People don't like to answer very long questionnaires, so we had to make a pragmatic decision as to what to include and what to exclude, so it's both a methodological pragmatic issue, but also a conceptual issue. I tried to come up with the fewer number of categories, that would be independent factors. We analyze these factors and they came out to be statistically independent from one another.

Sometimes if you add another factor it can confuse things. For example, if you were to add spiritual, I think it would have been confused with psychological, and if we would have added political, it might have been confused with community. When you

create a questionnaire, there is a whole science of psychometrics, which is not to say that we shouldn't have tried and perhaps there is room to improve upon it, but you always make a compromise between different considerations, you have to keep it short, you have to keep the categories neat and clean, they have to be orthogonal, they have to be independent from one another so, which is not to say that there isn't room for improvement, and including in the future.

Questioner B

This is a fundamental issue: working hard is not always good for the society (witness the environmental issues and nuclear accidents coming from so much working). The Japanese need to reconsider whether it is really good to just keep working hard. Is there any difference in terms of mentality between foreigners and Japanese?

Questioner C

The concept of well-being, or happiness as part of "fairness" and "justice", could be diverse. From today's discussions, I thought that in our life stages there can be childhood period, adolescent period, and the aged period. So the question is "if there can be different types of happiness, or well-being, depending on the historical and technological stage; or if there can instead be universal happiness or well-being".

Isaac Prilleltensky

I will offer my views as a foreigner, and please understand that I do not understand Japanese culture. I wish I understood your culture better but I'm going to give you some answers from research, from an international perspective. I believe that every

organization, every community, and every society from time to time, should ask itself big questions because asking big questions is a part of growth. If we stop asking questions, how can life be better, we are going to stop growing and developing. There are many cultural factors stopping us, preventing us from asking big questions because it's very threatening, because people feel afraid that if we ask big questions, society will disintegrate.

I believe that national dialogues are really important, and if you look internationally for example, some countries have had very difficult national dialogues, for example, truth and reconciliation in South Africa. It was a process to talk about apartheid and oppression but it was a healing process, very painful but very healing.

Basically, the answer is yes, I feel that if you are experiencing a lot of stress related to, let's say, a workaholic culture that people never stop, I believe that there is a price that is paid in mental health, in family wellbeing, in burnout, and that price is not sustainable. If you talk about sustainability, you cannot have a workforce, working 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, because they will drop dead, physically or psychologically. I don't think it is a sustainable proposition, I don't think it's healthy for anybody. I understand that it may have served Japan very well for many years, to have this very high work ethic, but from time to time, you have to stop and ask yourself, should we make a change to make life a little healthier.

Let me say a few words about happiness across the lifetime. The beautiful thing about happiness is that it can take a thousand or a million different ways, depending

on different people. But I think, the role of public policy and professionals is to create the conditions for people to flourish in a thousand different ways, which is a great promise of liberalism. The great promise of liberalism is I don't want to tell you how to be happy, I just want to provide as many people as I can with the basic conditions so that people can make an investment in themselves to become happy by being a soccer player or a great pianist, or the next Einstein, or the next astronaut. This is the beautiful thing about liberalism, trying to provide conditions for people to flourish and it is true. If you have the basic conditions met, you can rediscover yourself, and reinvent yourself across the lifetime. You see people changing careers because people feel, perhaps I have been a great doctor for 35 years, but now I want to be a great writer, that's one of the beautiful things about creating conditions for opportunities.

Society public policy can make opportunities. The rest is up to you. If you want to be a couch potato, and watch TV all day long, that's your decision, but society needs to do whatever it can to provide you with the education and the tools to make something better of yourself.

※This report is a best-effort record (with translation where necessary) of the symposium; it might therefore contain inaccurate words. We wish to thank all the speakers for their cooperation in preparing this paper.