

## Preface

Akira INOUE\*

*\*Editor-in-Chief of the Ars Vivendi Journal*

*Graduate School of Core Ethics and Frontier Sciences, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan*

This special issue “Radiation Risk, Rationality, and Indeterminacy” focuses on the questions of which preventive actions are rationally justified in response to moderately elevated radiation levels. Since the 2011 disaster at Fukushima nuclear power plant occurred, there have been intense debates among experts upon whether the Japanese government should have ordered mass evacuation of the apparently affected area soon after the accident. Their discussion, however, is often confusing, as in their arguments do not sort out relevant factors in evaluating the health risks of radiation and the costs of mass evacuation.

In his essay, entitled “Radiation and Rational Deliberation,” Martjin Boot provides an insightful analysis of existing debates in light of four factors which are familiar to decision theory: ignorance, insufficient information, inconclusiveness, and indeterminability. According to Boot, the uncertainty and disagreement about mass evacuation results mainly from the last two factors: inconclusiveness and indeterminability. Inconclusiveness is a main cause of disagreement about the evacuation policy because there is always uncertainty about the risks occasioned by low doses of nuclear radiation. Indeterminability is also an important factor of generating uncertainty, since additional risks of cancer, which may possibly be seen as outweighing the burden of mass evacuation, are rationally indeterminable from 10 to 500 msv per year. Boot’s paper theoretically shows the difficulties involved in our deliberative decisions about how we should act in the face of this nuclear disaster.

Paul Dumouchel provides an interesting response to Boot’s article. According to Dumouchel, the various agents such as the Japanese government and the French government acted fully rationally from a decision theoretical point of view, given that they were facing radically different situations that involved completely different costs and benefits. This suggestion may push us to carefully consider the limits of the decision theoretical point of view in the decision-making situation characterized by inconclusiveness and indeterminability. Rejoinders to this discussion are welcomed.

\*\*\*

In addition to the special issue, Tomohisa Hori contributes to this issue a translated paper “Anti-professionalism within Clinical Psychology: The Japanese Association of Clinical Psychology in the 1960s and 1970s.” The original paper was published in Japanese in the *Journal of Disability Studies* 7: 249-274. Our expectation is that Hori’s paper will prove of interests to many people in the relevant fields of studies throughout the world.