

## How to deal with the policies of government: From advocates to critics

HASHIMOTO, Manabu<sup>1\*</sup>, KAWAKATSU, Hitoshi<sup>2</sup>, SAGIYA, Takeshi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>DPRI, Kyoto University, <sup>2</sup>Earthquake Research Institute, University of Tokyo, <sup>3</sup>Disaster Mitigation Research Center, Nagoya University

We play a role of conveners in the Session 2 "How should SSJ relate to governmental policies? - What is the social role of scientists?" in Special Symposium held in the last Fall Meeting of Seismological Society of Japan. We continued discussion and would like to propose a new plan referring to these discussions and opinion papers submitted to the Special Report of the Symposium.

It is needless to say that the one of the desires of earthquake scientists is the reduction of earthquake disasters. However, there were few criticisms against policies of the government, since the national or local governments are in charge of earthquake disaster reductions and many researchers who are active in society are involved in these policies. Rather, annual meetings of societies were good opportunities to present their products or progress reports of projects sponsored by governments. The most typical example is "The Science of Earthquake Prediction", a popular book edited by The Earthquake Prediction Committee of the Seismological Society. For example, this book expresses an affirmative opinion for the Countermeasure Act against Great Earthquake, against which there are many objections in the Seismological Society, in a short column. Since such an address might have been regarded as the common view of the Seismological Society, it is very controversial. It is regrettable that we confronted with the East Japan Great Earthquake Disaster without any critical discussions against the long-term forecast for the Miyagi-oki earthquakes in related societies. We cannot find any objections to the criticism that scientists are advocates of the government.

Kawakatsu (2012) pointed out that the policies related to earthquake sciences are trans-scientific problems that cannot be solved only by sciences. There are several solutions for such problems. One solution is the Consensus Meeting. In Consensus Meeting, scientists provide with affirmative/negative opinions from several viewpoints to participants, in order to deepen the discussion of a specific theme. It may be very difficult for only scientists to hold such a meeting, but we believe that we can collect various opinions from different viewpoints and provide them with the participants of the meeting. Yomogida (2012) proposed that we should establish such a mechanism in societies. Should we introduce a variety of opinion on a specific social problem from personal and liberal standpoints? There is no doubt that the Hamaoka Power Plant problem is included in themes to be discussed.

At the end of 2011, the Central Disaster Prevention Committee of the National Government released a new source model for the great earthquake along the Nankai trough, but we have not heard any comments or criticisms from researchers. One of the authors, who is the member of the sub-committee, is surprised that very few colleagues in his surroundings say anything about this issue. It is essential to change the mind of researchers who do not recognize that they are also the persons concerned. We would like to propose a regular session where we discuss social problems in improve our consciousness of public.

Keywords: Disaster reduction policy, earthquake science, trans-science, scientific society, social problem