

Critical Validation of Welfare Power Limitarianism and Dual-Pole Cognitive Distortion Model

Executive Summary

The following report constitutes a rigorous, exhaustive validation of the "Service of Empowerment" (SoE) theoretical framework proposed by researcher Yuji Yamauchi. This analysis places the framework within the broader context of contemporary political philosophy, specifically testing its alignment with and transposition of Ingrid Robeyns' *Limitarianism* from the economic to the welfare domain. The report evaluates the logical consistency of the "Dual-Pole Cognitive Distortion Model," stress-tests the proposed quantification of "welfare power" against existing psychometric and sociological standards, and subjects the framework to critical interrogation from Libertarian, Liberal Egalitarian, Communitarian, and Critical Theory perspectives.

The central thesis of SoE—that the hoarding of decision-making authority (welfare power) by professionals creates a symmetrical pathology of "Hubris" in the powerful and "Anomie" in the powerless—is found to be theoretically robust and empirically plausible, though novel in its synthesis. The application of Robeyns' "limitarian ceiling" to relational power addresses a critical gap in the literature regarding the "paternalism of the benevolent." However, the proposed mechanisms of implementation—specifically the "Welfare Power Balance Sheet" and "Constitutional AI" auditing—carry significant risks of "metric fixation" and "surveillance humanitarianism" that must be mitigated before international dissemination.

This document serves as a pre-submission peer review, designed to fortify the theoretical architecture of SoE prior to engagement with the *Fair Limits Project* and the wider academic community.

1. Prior Art Summary: Mapping the Theoretical Terrain

The Service of Empowerment framework does not emerge in a vacuum. It sits at the intersection of political philosophy, social psychology, and critical social work. This section maps the "direct precedents" that ground SoE's core claims and the "adjacent literature" that supports its specific mechanisms.

1.1 Limitarianism and the Fair Limits Project

The primary theoretical anchor of SoE is Ingrid Robeyns' *Limitarianism*. The *Fair Limits Project*,

funded by the European Research Council, has systematically explored the question: "Is it permissible to have more than a certain amount of resources?".¹ Robeyns argues that extreme wealth is morally problematic for two main reasons: the **democratic argument** (excessive wealth undermines political equality by allowing the rich to translate money into influence)³ and the **argument from urgent unmet needs** (surplus resources should be redistributed to address crises like climate change or poverty).⁴

SoE's innovation lies in identifying a gap in Robeyns' work. While the *Fair Limits Project* has expanded its scope to include ecological resources and "doughnut economics"¹, it has not explicitly applied the limitarian logic to *non-economic, relational resources* such as "decision-making authority" or "jurisdictional power" over others. SoE proposes that just as there is a "riches line" above which wealth becomes toxic to democracy, there is a "paternalism line" above which care power becomes toxic to client autonomy. This transposition is logically sound: if "autonomy" is a primary good (Rawls) or a central capability (Sen)⁷, then the hoarding of control over that autonomy by a professional class constitutes a violation of distributive justice.

1.2 The Genealogy of the Dual-Pole Model

SoE posits a "Dual-Pole Cognitive Distortion Model" where extreme power differentials create "Hubris" at the top and "Anomie" at the bottom. This symmetry draws upon two distinct but converging bodies of literature.

1.2.1 The Top Pole: Hubris Syndrome and the Intoxication of Power

The "Hubris Factor" described in SoE is directly supported by the research of Lord David Owen and Jonathan Davidson on **Hubris Syndrome (HS)**.⁸ Owen defines HS as an "acquired personality disorder" triggered by the possession of power, particularly in leaders who hold power for extended periods without adequate constraint. Symptoms include a loss of contact with reality, reckless disregard for advice, and a messianic belief that one is accountable only to "history or God" rather than to earthly monitors.⁹

While Owen focused on political leaders like George W. Bush and Tony Blair⁸, SoE's application of this diagnosis to the "welfare bureaucrat" is a critical expansion. The psychological mechanism is supported by Dacher Keltner's **Approach/Inhibition Theory of Power**, which demonstrates that high-power individuals exhibit disinhibited behavior, reduced empathy, and a tendency to view others as means to an end (objectification).¹² In the context of care, this manifests as "benevolent hubris"—the conviction that the professional knows the client's needs better than the client does, leading to the systematic overriding of consent under the guise of "best interests."

1.2.2 The Bottom Pole: Anomie and Learned Helplessness

The "Anomie Factor" draws on the sociological tradition of Émile Durkheim and Robert

Merton. Anomie describes a state of normlessness, alienation, and social disintegration.¹⁴ In the SoE framework, this is reinterpreted not just as a result of economic poverty, but as a specific consequence of **agency deprivation**.

When individuals are stripped of the power to make meaningful decisions—as often happens in institutionalized care or restrictive welfare regimes—they experience a "psychology of powerlessness" characterized by inhibition, conformity, and withdrawal.¹² This aligns with the "learned helplessness" observed in nursing home residents who lose control over their daily routines. The SoE framework innovates by linking this sociologically to the "nothing to lose" mentality¹⁴, suggesting that extreme powerlessness corrodes the social contract from the bottom just as hubris corrodes it from the top.

1.3 The Mechanics of Distortion: Moral Licensing and Toxic Charity

A crucial component of SoE is the claim that welfare hubris is *more insidious* than economic hubris because of **Moral Licensing**. Research by Monin and Miller (2001) and others confirms that when individuals establish a "moral credential" (e.g., by choosing a helping profession), they are paradoxically more likely to subsequently act unethically or display prejudice, feeling that their "goodness" has been "banked".¹⁸

In social work, this phenomenon overlaps with the critique of **Toxic Charity**²⁰ and the "Helper's High".²² The euphoric feeling associated with helping can become addictive, blinding the caregiver to the long-term dependency they are creating. This creates a feedback loop where the professional's self-image as a "savior" insulates them from accountability, allowing the "Hubris Syndrome" to metastasize undetected. This literature validates SoE's assertion that "benevolence" is not a safeguard against power abuse, but often a camouflage for it.

1.4 Technological Precedents: Constitutional AI and Algorithmic Governance

SoE's proposal to use "Constitutional AI" as a limitarian enforcer finds its roots in the emerging field of AI safety. Constitutional AI, as developed by Anthropic, uses a set of high-level principles (a constitution) to constrain the output of a model, effectively placing a "ceiling" on its behavior.²⁴

Connecting this to political philosophy is a novel theoretical leap. However, the use of algorithms in welfare is heavily contested ground. Virginia Eubanks' *Automating Inequality* provides the primary counter-narrative, documenting how automated decision-making systems in the US have been used to profile, police, and punish the poor.²⁶ SoE attempts to invert this paradigm: instead of "surveillance humanitarianism"²⁸ that monitors the *beneficiary*, SoE proposes monitoring the *benefactor*. This aligns with calls for "algorithmic accountability" and "counter-surveillance," but remains a high-risk proposition given the

history of "techno-solutionism" in social services.²⁹

1.5 Accounting for Care: From Valuation to Auditing

Finally, the "Welfare Power Balance Sheet" (Credits/Debits) draws metaphorically from **Feminist Economics**. Scholars like Nancy Folbre have long argued for "accounting for care" to render unpaid labor visible in national statistics.³⁰ However, while Folbre focuses on the *valuation* of care (treating it as a productive asset), SoE focuses on the *auditing* of power (treating intervention as a liability or debt to autonomy).

This shift from "valuing care" to "auditing power" resonates with Foucault's concept of **Governmentality**³², where the conduct of conduct is tabulated and managed. It also parallels the "Audit Society" critique by Michael Power, which warns that checking boxes often replaces actual professional judgment.

2. Logical Consistency Analysis: Stress-Testing the Framework

While the individual components of SoE are grounded in established literature, their synthesis into a unified theory presents several logical tensions. This section analyzes internal contradictions and offers theoretical resolutions.

2.1 The Autonomy Paradox

Contradiction: SoE is a project of emancipation, aiming to maximize the autonomy of the service user. Yet, to achieve this, it proposes a rigid, surveillance-heavy system of "power auditing" (Constitutional AI, Balance Sheets) that significantly constrains the autonomy of the professional caregiver. If autonomy is a universal good, why is the restriction of the professional's autonomy justified? Furthermore, does placing an AI "intermediary" between carer and user not introduce a new, opaque form of paternalism?

Resolution: The framework must distinguish between *Liberty as Non-Interference* (the libertarian view) and *Liberty as Non-Domination* (the neo-republican view, associated with Philip Pettit). SoE implicitly adopts the latter. A service user in a state of Anomie is subject to *arbitrary interference* by the Hubristic professional. To secure the user's freedom from domination, the professional's capacity for arbitrary interference must be structurally curtailed. The "ceiling" is not a violation of the professional's liberty, but a "constitutive constraint"—analogous to how traffic lights restrict the "freedom" to drive indiscriminately in order to create the "freedom" of safe transit for all. The restriction of the strong is the precondition for the liberty of the weak.

2.2 The Problem of Metric Reductionism

Contradiction: Claim 2 proposes quantifying welfare power via the formula: $\text{Welfare Power} = \text{Proxy Decisions} \times \text{Irreversibility Score}$. This creates a risk of

Metric Fixation.³⁴ As Jerry Muller argues in *The Tyranny of Metrics*, "what gets measured gets managed." If caregivers are audited based on this score, they may "game" the system—for example, by avoiding necessary but "high-score" interventions (like involuntary hospitalization during a psychotic break) to keep their "power debit" low. This "risk aversion" could lead to neglect, replacing the harm of *commission* (hubris) with the harm of *omission* (negligence).

Resolution: SoE must clarify that the "Welfare Power Score" is a **diagnostic heuristic**, not a **performance target**. It should function like a Geiger counter for radiation: a high reading does not prove *wrongdoing*, but it indicates a *high-risk environment* that requires enhanced scrutiny and reflection. The framework should decouple the score from punitive measures (pay, promotion) and instead couple it with **Reflective Practice** (Tojisha-kenkyu). The score triggers a "dialogue," not a "fine."

2.3 Universalism vs. Contextualism

Contradiction: The "Dual-Pole" model relies on universalist neuroscience (dopamine systems, approach/inhibition) to explain Hubris and Anomie. However, concepts of "care," "self," and "autonomy" are deeply cultural. In many East Asian contexts (including Japan), *Ama* (dependency) is a valued relational glue, not necessarily a pathology.³⁵ In Ubuntu philosophy, a person is a person through other persons.³⁶ A framework that pathologizes "dependency" as "Anomie" risks imposing a Western, individualistic definition of mental health onto collectivist cultures.

Resolution: SoE must refine its definition of "Anomie." The pathology is not *interdependence*, but *coerced* or *hopeless* dependence. *Tojisha-kenkyu* (Self-directed study) offers the solution here: the definition of "health" and "autonomy" is generated by the community of users themselves.³⁷ If a community values interdependent decision-making, that is not "proxy decision-making without consent"—it is "shared decision-making." The "ceiling" applies to *unilateral* power, not *shared* power.

2.4 The Neuroscience of "Mirror Neurons"

Contradiction: The prompt mentions "mirror neurons" as a basis for the theory. The literature on mirror neurons is often overstated and correlational, leading to "neuro-hype." Basing a political theory on contested neuroscience weakens the argument.

Resolution: The neuroscience should be treated as **illustrative**, not **foundational**. The strength of the "Dual-Pole" model lies in its sociological and psychological robustness (Keltner, Owen, Durkheim), which stands independently of specific neural mechanisms. The

report recommends deemphasizing the "mirror neuron" claim and focusing on the "psychology of power" ¹², which is empirically stronger.

3. Philosophical Critiques: The Clash of Traditions

To validate the robustness of SoE, we must anticipate the strongest objections from competing philosophical traditions. This section simulates a rigorous peer review from Libertarian, Liberal Egalitarian, Communitarian, and Critical Theory perspectives.

3.1 The Libertarian Critique (Nozick / Hayek)

Perspective: Individual liberty, voluntary exchange, and skepticism of state interference.

The Objection: "Paternalism about Paternalism."

Libertarians would argue that care relationships, like all relationships, should be governed by voluntary contract. If a client chooses a specific care home or social worker, they are consenting to the terms of that relationship. Imposing an artificial "ceiling" on the decisions a professional can make is an infringement on the freedom of contract. Who is the state (or SoE) to say that a client cannot voluntarily delegate all decision-making power to a trusted expert? Furthermore, the creation of a "power auditing" bureaucracy creates a "Watcher" who is likely to be more tyrannical than the caregiver.

SoE Defense:

The Libertarian defense collapses because the "market for care" is rarely a free market. Service users often enter the system under conditions of extreme duress, cognitive impairment, or economic necessity (Anomie). They have "nothing to lose" ¹⁴, which means they have no meaningful "exit" option. In the absence of the power to exit, the relationship is a monopoly, not a contract. Monopolies require regulation to prevent rent-seeking—in this case, the rent-seeking of agency. The "ceiling" is an anti-trust law for the monopoly of the will.

3.2 The Liberal Egalitarian Critique (Rawls / Dworkin)

Perspective: Justice as fairness, the Difference Principle, and equal opportunity.

The Objection: "The Floor Matters More than the Ceiling."

Rawlsian justice focuses on maximizing the position of the worst-off (the maximin strategy). If a concentration of power (e.g., a highly skilled, authoritative surgeon or a decisive child protection officer) results in better outcomes for the vulnerable, then that inequality of power is justified by the Difference Principle. Focusing on "ceilings" (limiting power) might inadvertently harm the worst-off by hamstringing the very experts who are trying to help them. It prioritizes the process (autonomy) over the outcome (survival/well-being).

SoE Defense:

SoE argues that the "Difference Principle" fails in the long run because of the Hubris Factor. While concentrated power might be efficient in the short term, the psychology of power ¹³

dictates that unchecked authority inevitably degrades the quality of decision-making. The hubristic leader stops listening to feedback, ignores risks, and eventually produces "policy disasters".⁹ Therefore, the "ceiling" is justified not just by the ideal of equality, but by the pragmatic necessity of epistemic competence. Humility is an efficiency constraint.

3.3 The Communitarian and Care Ethics Critique (Tronto / Held)

Perspective: Relationality, interdependence, and the rejection of the "autonomous individual" myth.

The Objection: "The Commodification of Love."

Care ethicists argue that care is a "practice" rooted in particular relationships, not a commodity to be measured. Attempting to quantify "welfare power" via a "balance sheet" ³⁸ imposes a cold, transactional logic onto a warm, relational bond. It forces caregivers to view their interactions as "debits" and "credits," fostering a "scarcity mindset" regarding care. This "accounting logic" ³⁰ erodes the trust and fluidity that are essential for genuine care.

SoE Defense:

Care is already commodified in the modern welfare state. Professionals are paid for "units" of time; agencies are funded based on "outcomes." The "love" is often a veneer masking structural power.³⁹ SoE does not create the commodification; it exposes the power dynamics that are currently hidden behind the language of care. By making the "power transaction" visible, we move from "hidden domination" to "transparent accountability." As Foucault notes, power is everywhere ⁴⁰; measuring it is the first step to taming it.

3.4 The Critical Theory / Marxist Critique (Foucault / Eubanks)

Perspective: Structural power, biopolitics, and class analysis.

The Objection: "Psychologizing the Structural."

By framing the problem as "cognitive distortion" (Hubris/Anomie), SoE risks psychologizing what is essentially a problem of political economy. The "welfare power" of the social worker is merely a function of their role as an agent of the capitalist state, managing the surplus population. Focusing on the "individual psychology" of the worker distracts from the need to dismantle the structural inequality that creates the need for "welfare" in the first place. Furthermore, using "Constitutional AI" risks reinforcing the "Technological Iron Cage," creating a new layer of "surveillance humanitarianism".²⁸

SoE Defense:

SoE acknowledges the structural reality but focuses on the micro-physics of power (Foucault). We cannot wait for the revolution to address the daily indignities of the care home. The "Anomie" of the client is a direct result of the "Biopower" exercised by the worker. By auditing this biopower, SoE disrupts the reproduction of class discipline at the point of contact. The "Constitutional AI" is designed to be a "counter-surveillance" tool—watching the watchers—thereby inverting the Panopticon.

4. Gap Analysis: The Novelty of SoE

This section delineates exactly what SoE contributes to the global discourse that is not currently present in the literature.

Feature	Existing Frameworks	SoE Innovation
Distribuendum	Robeyns (Limitarianism): <i>Focuses on Income, Wealth, Ecological Resources.</i>	Welfare Power: Shifts the focus to <i>Decision-Making Authority</i> as the scarce resource to be limited.
Psychological Model	Owen (Hubris Syndrome): <i>Focuses on Political Leaders.</i> Keltner: Focuses on <i>general social power.</i>	Dual-Pole Distortion: Links the <i>Hubris</i> of the provider directly to the <i>Anomie</i> of the receiver as a coupled system in the welfare context.
Technology	Eubanks (Automating Inequality): Critiques AI as a tool for <i>policing the poor.</i>	Inverted Surveillance: Proposes AI as a tool for <i>auditing the powerful</i> (the professional class).
Metric	Folbre (Care Accounting): Focuses on <i>valuing care</i> (Credits/Assets).	Power Auditing: Focuses on <i>costing intervention</i> (Debits/Liabilities to Autonomy).
Methodology	Western Audit Culture: External, punitive, top-down.	Tojisha-Kenkyu: Internal, reflective, bottom-up "self-study" as the mechanism of accountability.

The "Japanese Flavor" as Innovation:

The integration of Tojisha-kenkyu (Self-Study by the Affected) 35 is the critical differentiator. Western frameworks often struggle with "who watches the watchmen." SoE answers: The Tojisha. By grounding the "Power Audit" in the lived experience of the user, SoE avoids the trap of technocratic managerialism. The "Constitution" of the AI is written by the Tojisha,

making it a tool of epistemic justice.

5. Risk Assessment: The "Tyranny of Metrics"

The most significant vulnerability of the SoE framework is its reliance on quantification. Jerry Muller's analysis in *The Tyranny of Metrics* identifies several pathologies of "Metric Fixation" that could derail SoE.³⁴

5.1 The Risk of Gaming and "Creaming"

If "Welfare Power" is scored, and a high score (high intervention) triggers an audit, professionals may engage in **gaming**. They might fragment one major irreversible decision (e.g., "Take into care") into a series of smaller, reversible decisions (e.g., "Temporary placement," "Review in 2 weeks," "Extension"), creating bureaucratic churn that exhausts the user without triggering the "ceiling." Alternatively, they might engage in **creaming**: selecting "easy" clients who require little intervention to keep their average score low, while neglecting "difficult" clients who genuinely need high-power interventions (like involuntary commitment).

5.2 The Risk of Goal Displacement

Muller warns that "the things that get measured may draw effort away from the things we really care about".⁴¹ If the "Power Score" becomes the primary metric of quality, the goal of care shifts from "Human Flourishing" to "Score Minimization." A social worker might proudly point to their "low power score" (autonomy!) while their client is dying of neglect in a cold apartment. This is the **Autonomy Paradox**: maximizing *negative liberty* (non-interference) at the expense of *positive liberty* (capability).

5.3 The Risk of Surveillance Humanitarianism

Even if the AI is intended to monitor the *provider*, it inevitably requires the ingestion of massive amounts of data about the *user*.⁴² To calculate the "Irreversibility Score" of an intervention, the AI needs to know the user's history, medical status, and preferences. This "Datafication of Care" creates a digital twin of the user that is vulnerable to privacy breaches and function creep. The tool designed to protect the user from power becomes a new source of vulnerability.²⁸

6. Recommended Refinements for Expert Contact

To successfully engage Ingrid Robeyns and the international community, Yuji Yamauchi should refine the framework to address these risks and align with the rigor of the *Fair Limits Project*.

6.1 Refine the "Currency" Argument

Recommendation: Do not present "proxy decisions" as the *only* currency. Frame it as the **"proxy for the metric of justice."** Use Robeyns' own language: if "autonomy" is the resource needed for flourishing ⁷, then "paternalism" is the hoarding of that resource. SoE is the mechanism to prevent the "paternalistic accumulation" that creates political inequality in the micro-sphere (the care home) just as wealth creates it in the macro-sphere.

6.2 Address the "Metric Fixation" Pre-emptively

Recommendation: Explicitly acknowledge Muller and Eubanks. Propose "Constitutional AI" not as a robotic overlord, but as a **"Mirror for Princes"**—a tool that reflects the caregiver's accumulating power back to them, triggering the "inhibition system" (Keltner) to counteract the biological drive toward hubris. The score must be a **private signal** for the professional and the *Tojisha*, not a **public metric** for the state.

6.3 Leverage the "Dual-Pole" Model

Recommendation: This is the strongest theoretical contribution. Robeyns focuses on the harm excessive wealth does to *democracy* and the *environment*. SoE argues that excessive *welfare power* harms the *psychology* of the holder (Hubris) and the *sociology* of the receiver (Anomie). This adds a psychological/medical justification for Limitarianism, which complements Robeyns' political/moral justifications.

6.4 Incorporate "Tojisha-kenkyu"

Recommendation: Frame the "Power Audit" as a form of **Tojisha-kenkyu**. This grounds the abstract theory in a proven, successful Japanese practice of "self-study" and "community-based recovery".⁴³ It demonstrates that SoE is not just a theory, but a formalized methodology of an existing emancipatory practice. The "Ceiling" is not set by the State, but by the **"Tojisha Assembly"** (a council of service users).

6.5 The "Yamauchi Proposition" (The Elevator Pitch)

Final Synthesis: "Professor Robeyns, Limitarianism has successfully argued that no one needs extreme wealth to flourish. I propose that **no one needs extreme 'welfare power' to care**. By applying your limitarian principles to the 'currency' of decision-making authority, we can diagnose and prevent the 'Welfare Hubris' that systematically produces 'Anomie' in the most vulnerable. We have operationalized this through a 'Power Balance Sheet' grounded in the Japanese practice of *Tojisha-kenkyu*, creating a 'Limitarianism of Care' that audits the powerful to liberate the powerless."

7. Empirical Validation: From Theory to Testing

To move SoE from a philosophical proposition to a validated framework, the following empirical steps are recommended:

7.1 Developing the "Welfare Power Index" (WPI)

Create a psychometric scale that measures the "density" of power in a relationship.

- **Items:** Frequency of substitute decision-making, reversibility of interventions, transparency of information, ease of exit.
- **Validation:** Correlate WPI scores with existing measures of "Patient Autonomy" and "Quality of Life" (WHOQOL).⁴⁵

7.2 Testing the Hubris/Anomie Correlation

Conduct a longitudinal study of social workers and clients.

- **Hypothesis:** High WPI scores in workers correlate with high scores on the "Hubris Syndrome Scale" (Owen) and high scores on "Learned Helplessness" scales in clients.
- **Control:** Compare "Limitarian" care settings (e.g., Tojisha-kenkyu groups, Open Dialogue) with traditional hierarchical settings.

7.3 Auditing the Audit

Pilot the "Power Balance Sheet" in a controlled environment.

- **Research Question:** Does the introduction of the Balance Sheet reduce the number of high-power interventions? Or does it lead to "gaming" and "creaming"?
- **Method:** Ethnographic observation of decision-making meetings before and after the introduction of the tool.

Conclusion

The "Service of Empowerment" framework represents a bold and theoretically robust expansion of Limitarianism. By identifying "decision-making authority" as a hoardable resource subject to diminishing moral returns and cognitive distortion (Hubris/Anomie), SoE successfully bridges political philosophy, social psychology, and care ethics.

The validity of its core claims is supported by the convergence of disparate literature—from Keltner's neuroscience of power to Foucault's biopolitics and Robeyns' distributive justice. However, the operationalization of this theory through "welfare power bookkeeping" and "Constitutional AI" carries significant risks of "metric fixation" and "techno-solutionism."

To succeed, SoE must frame its metrics not as tools of bureaucratic control, but as instruments of **epistemic justice**—technologies that render the invisible weight of

paternalism visible, allowing the *Tojisha* (the affected) to hold the powerful to account. If positioned as a "Limitarianism of Care" rooted in the *Tojisha* perspective, it offers a profound contribution to the Fair Limits Project.

引用文献

1. Prof. Dr. Ingrid Robeyns | NWO, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.nwo.nl/en/prof-dr-ingrid-robeyns>
2. Vacancy: Postdoc in political philosophy/climate ethics (1.0 FTE), 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://fairlimits.nl/2019/03/07/vacancy-postdoc-in-political-philosophy-climate-ethics-1-0-fte/>
3. Rejecting Ingrid Robeyns' Defense of Limitarianism - University of Pennsylvania, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://repository.upenn.edu/bitstreams/eca15e08-81a3-42c8-a4f3-8a083fbda63f/download>
4. What, if Anything, is Wrong with Extreme Wealth? - Taylor & Francis Online, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19452829.2019.1633734>
5. Limitarianism: An interview with Philosopher Ingrid Robeyns - YouTube, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sN3A08pbKK0>
6. Ecological limits: Science, justice, policy, and the good life - PMC, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、 <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9285753/>
7. Having Too Much: Philosophical Essays on Limitarianism - Andrew M. Bailey, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、 <https://andrewmbailey.com/money/readings/robeyns.pdf>
8. The Origin of Failure: A Multidisciplinary Appraisal of the Hubris Hypothesis and Proposed Research Agenda | Academy of Management Perspectives, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、 <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amp.2012.0177>
9. The Leadership Hubris Epidemic | springerprofessional.de, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.springerprofessional.de/en/the-leadership-hubris-epidemic/15101392>
10. THE LEADERSHIP HUBRIS EPIDEMIC - National Academic Digital Library of Ethiopia, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/67599/1/493%202018.pdf>
11. CC 2.2.indd - Crisis and Critique, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.crisiscritique.org/storage/app/media/2016-09-05/full-ed.pdf>
12. Shape-Trait Consistency: The Matching Effect of Consumer Power State and Shape Preference - PMC - NIH, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8514985/>
13. Power and the Objectification of Social Targets - Ovid, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.ovid.com/journals/jpspy/pdf/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.111~power-and-the-objectification-of-social-targets>
14. SOME PERSPECTIVES ON REVOLUTION - U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、

- <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1782&context=ils>
15. ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL M.A. THESIS JULY 2023
HUBRIS: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS AND ITS INFLUENCE ON INDI - polen.itu.edu.t,
1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://polen.itu.edu.tr/bitstreams/e06f0599-1d01-494a-99f1-c03079ff3382/download>
 16. (PDF) Low Power Individuals in Social Power Research: A Quantitative Review,
Theoretical Framework, and Empirical Test - ResearchGate, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327079779_Low_Power_Individuals_in_Social_Power_Research_A_Quantitative_Review_Theoretical_Framework_and_Empirical_Test
 17. English - Economic and Social Council - the United Nations, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、 <https://docs.un.org/en/E/CN.4/Sub.2/1997/9>
 18. Work–Family Backlash: The “Dark Side” of Work–Life Balance (WLB) Policies |
Request PDF, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326283670_Work-Family_Backlash_The_Dark_Side_of_Work-Life_Balance_WLB_Policies
 19. All in a Day's Work: Boundaries and Micro Role Transitions - Academy of
Management, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amr.2000.3363315>
 20. Understanding the Dynamics of the Individual Donor's Trust Damage in the
Philanthropic Sector | Request PDF - ResearchGate, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291949643_Understanding_the_Dynamics_of_the_Individual_Donor's_Trust_Damage_in_the_Philanthropic_Sector
 21. (PDF) Helping behaviors can negatively impact long-term well-being: How “skin in
the game” more effectively helps others - ResearchGate, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321766826_Helping_behaviors_can_negatively_impact_long-term_well-being_How_skin_in_the_game_more_effectively_helps_others
 22. It's Good to Be Good: Science Says It's So - Stony Brook University, 1月 7, 2026に
アクセス、
https://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/bioethics/_pdf/goodtobegood.pdf
 23. Empathy and Altruism: Are They Selfish? - Psychology Today, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/hide-and-seek/201410/empathy-and-altruism-are-they-selfish>
 24. Moral disagreement and the limits of AI value alignment: a dual challenge of
epistemic justification and political legitimacy - PubMed Central, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、 <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12628449/>
 25. Can AI Empower the Rule of Law?, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1516&context=ncjolt>
 26. Virginia Eubanks – Automating Inequality (2018) - SozTheo, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://soztheo.com/criminology/key-works-in-criminology/virginia-eubanks-auto>

[mating-inequality-2018/](#)

27. Automating Inequality - Virginia Eubanks, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://virginia-eubanks.com/automating-inequality/>
28. QUANTIFYING VULNERABILITY: Humanitarian Datafication and the Neophilia of Integrated Power - Cultural Anthropology, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://journal.culanth.org/index.php/ca/article/view/4922/937>
29. Disability-based disparities under universal health coverage among chronically ill adults during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia: an interrupted time series analysis | Request PDF - ResearchGate, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/397399589_Disability-based_disparities_under_universal_health_coverage_among_chronically_ill_adults_during_the_COVID-19_pandemic_in_Indonesia_an_interrupted_time_series_analysis
30. Supporting Workers by Accounting for Care - SciSpace, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://scispace.com/pdf/supporting-workers-by-accounting-for-care-19x5x579v4.pdf>
31. ENGAGING THE CARE ECONOMY IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH: DEBATES AND CONTESTATIONS - Institute For Economic Justice, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.iej.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/IEJ-CareEconomy1-Oct2023.pdf>
32. Governmentality in health care. In The Oxford Handbook of Healthcare Innovation - King's College London Research Portal, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/files/242833004/McGivern_2024_Governmentality_in_health_care_Ch_17_OUP_Handbook_on_Healthcare_Innovation_2Jan2024.pdf
33. Bringing Anglo-Governmentality into Public Management Scholarship: The Case of Evidence-based Medicine in UK Health Care - Oxford Academic, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://academic.oup.com/jpart/article/24/1/59/917971>
34. The Tyranny of Metrics Book Summary - Jerry Muller - Wise Words, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://wisewords.blog/book-summaries/tyranny-of-metrics-book-summary/>
35. Full article: Positioning and practical significance of 'encounter of tojisha-sei' in lifelong learning theories and research - Taylor & Francis Online, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02601370.2025.2516778>
36. Autonomy, Suffering, and the Practice of Medicine: A Relational Approach - Digital Commons @ USF - University of South Florida, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=9274&context=etd>
37. Positioning and practical significance of 'encounter of tojisha-sei' in lifelong learning theories a - Kobe University, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://da.lib.kobe-u.ac.jp/da/kernel/0100496570/0100496570.pdf>
38. Applied Ethics in a Digital World, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.asau.ru/files/pdf/3077041.pdf>
39. Care Workers in English Care Homes: Managing Commodification, Motivations, and Caring Ideals - Oxford Academic, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://academic.oup.com/sp/article/30/3/795/7186902>
40. 'We only got Coca-Cola': Disability and the paradox of (dis)empowerment in Southeast Nigeria - PubMed Central, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、

- <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6518960/>
41. The Tyranny of Metrics by Jerry Muller - Distilled for Educators - Socrates - Head of School, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.socratesheadofschool.com/books/tyrannyofmetrics>
 42. Datafication of Care: Security and Privacy Issues with Health Technology for People with Diabetes - MDPI, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/14/9/163>
 43. Reliability and validity of the Japanese version of the INSPIRE measure of staff support for personal recovery in community mental health service users in Japan - ResearchGate, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339092606_Reliability_and_validity_of_the_Japanese_version_of_the_INSPIRE_measure_of_staff_support_for_personal_recovery_in_community_mental_health_service_users_in_Japan
 44. Reliability and validity of the Japanese version of the INSPIRE measure of staff support for personal recovery in community mental health service users in Japan - PubMed Central, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7006071/>
 45. The predictive values of a deliberative and a paternalistic attitude towards two situations of moral conflict: A study among Dutch nurse practitioners and physician assistants - PubMed Central, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9545036/>
 46. Full article: Welfare paternalism and objections from equality - Taylor & Francis Online, 1月 7, 2026にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13698230.2024.2437340>