

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18485/philologia.2020.18.18.5>

UDC: 821.111-31.09 Ishiguro K.

■ THE INVISIBLE HAND IN *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY*

AMALIA CĂLINESCU¹

University of Bucharest

Doctoral School of Literary and Cultural Studies

Bucharest, Romania

Jedna od tvrdnji savremenog ekonomiste Erika Bajnhokera (Eric D. Beinhocker) jeste da se ekonomija zasniva na mogućnosti izbora i donošenju odluka. Ovu tvrdnju, kroz prikaz postupaka u donošenju odluka na mikronivou, engleski pisac japanskog porekla Kazuo Išiguro pokušava da potvrdi u svom trećem romanu *Ostaci dana*. Pisac u romanu daje i književni odgovor na ono što predstavlja večitu dilemu svih ekonomista: Zašto je ideja *nevidljive ruke*, koju je predložio otac savremenih ekonomskih nauka Adam Smit, do te mere nazamisliva u stvarnom svetu?

Ključne reči: Kazuo Išiguro, *Ostaci dana*, nevidljiva ruka, bihejvioralna ekonomija, heuristika, teorija igara, prospekt teorija, interdisciplinarno.

1. WHY AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH

Reality and the illusion of it have been debated in tandem for such a long time. Perhaps Shakespeare, Nietzsche and Jung form one of the most emblematic triangles in this respect, although the list of those willing to delimit the two planes may be very long, encompassing all areas of human experience, from spirituality to quantum mechanics (Strauch 1999: 23–41).

The natural separation of subjects, periods, nationalities or languages can underlie the progress of collective knowledge as long as mankind remains aware that this simplification by division does not also mean the real separation of the studied phenomena.

In "Reflections on the History of Ideas", the American philosopher and intellectual historian Arthur O. Lovejoy argues that, no matter how logically separated the modes of existential expression may be, they must remain in a continuous relationship (1940: 10).

1 Kontakt podaci (Email): amalia.calinescu@drd.unibuc.ro

The departments that reflect the history of political events and social movements, as well as the economic, religious, philosophical, scientific, literary, artistic and educational changes, are usually investigated by different groups of specialists, most of whom are less familiar with the research objects of their colleagues from the other areas of research and activity. However, cognitive processes, either individual or collective, should always function as a unitary whole, independent of the compartmentalization made for practical purposes in all aspects of life (Lovejoy 1940: 14). Only mental cooperation, from intuitionism to rationalism, could lead to a far more complex understanding of the world's phenomenology. According to Levinas, objective knowing entails the communion of all valid theories and ideas so much so that each pertinent thought should contain a reference to the thoughts of the other people (1969: 32).

2. THE INVISIBLE HAND AND DIVISION OF LABOUR

The two emblematic concepts proposed by the father of modern economics, Adam Smith, are *the division of labour* and *the invisible hand*, since only together can they sustain economic prosperity.

The competitive division of labour entails specialisation and focus on single tasks, leading to significant productivity, lower prices and wellbeing.

However, like Lovejoy and Levinas, Smith considers this economic reality, nowadays directly related to human capital, a real hindrance if not paired with healthy interconnection.

The sincere interaction of supply and demand has the power to regulate both prices and people's conduct in any multi-marketed economy, leading to economic balance and prosperity. In other words, people working on specialised fields should also cooperate for the progress of human kind, otherwise the consequences of division will be devastating. That is why the division of labour should always be understood in tandem with the invisible hand:

[...] every individual necessarily labours to render the annual revenue of the society as great as he can. [...] By preferring the support of domestic to that of foreign industry, he intends only his own security; and by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention. [...] By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it. (Smith 2009: 456)

Only rational self-interest and correct competition can lead to economic progress, states Smith:

It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address

ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages." (Smith 2009: 26–27)

Smith's invisible hand is thus an economic concept that stands for the sincere motivation behind all the correct transactions on a free market, although it can, in truth, be applied to all walks of life, since all of them entail human interaction of one kind or another.

3. A SHAKY HAND

The integrated vision of Lovejoy, Levinas and Smith could represent the basis for an interdisciplinary approach to *The Remains of the Day*, focused on the fusion of literature and economics.

Kazuo Ishiguro's third novel has been widely regarded as a postcolonial novel, although, viewed from Mr Stevens' subjective perspective, it is rather the reverted image of postcolonialism and therefore a shaky version of Smith's invisible hand.

The idea of England as the civilizer of the rest of the Earth is obviously mocked through the image of Lord Darlington: the typical English gentleman, correct, generous, idealistic, honourable, and well-behaved until his Nazi-linked choices and decisions set him off in a downward spiral... and the rest is history as we know it.

To be so easily tricked into following the racial doctrine of the Nazis and the fascists can only show Lord Darlington as an irrational believer in the superiority of the English race.

On a macro level, Darlington Hall seems to embody any stratified society that successfully applies Smith's division of labour and invisible hand. The many-roomed mansion is tended with clockwork precision by Mr Stevens, who expertly assigns and supervises all the economic roles under his jurisdiction.

Nevertheless, Smith's prosperity concepts fail miserably within the confines of Darlington Hall for the same reasons Smith has once warned they will fail: the existence of the markets privileged by the government.

In other words, Lord Darlington chooses to ally himself to politicians with corrupt socio-economic views, his choice rendering his butler's greatness and dignity pointless.

Ishiguro declares that he is particularly attracted to the pre- and post-war periods only because they best test all socio-human values through the contrast between personal and collective memory (Lewis 2001: 46).

The life of a society is less dramatic than the life of an individual living in a particular period:

Recently I've been interested in the difference between personal memory and societal memory, and I'm tempted almost to personify these two things. A society, a nation, goes on and on, for centuries: it can turn Nazi for a while and cause mayhem. But then the next generation comes along and says, you know, "We're not going to make that mistake again." Whereas an individual who happens to live through the Nazi era in Germany, that's his whole life. (Vorda/Herzinger 1994: 25)

The English author of Japanese origin may not have consciously wanted to write a historiographic metafiction, but it is quite impossible to ignore the historical background of the novel, along with its socio-economic implications, when real-life personalities like Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden, Lord Halifax, Sir Oswald Mosley, John Maynard Keynes or H. G. Wells appear as indirect characters in the novel (Hutcheon 1988: 284–295).

It could thus be hypothesised that, besides the psychological implications of recollecting, the novel depicts England's socio-economic situation between 1920s and 1950s – the economic crisis of the pre-war Britain, the mid-30s colonialism and the post-war postcolonialism – as a partly distorted representation of Smith's invisible hand (Wren 1996: 13–16).

There is also a fourth dimension, since the rigid social hierarchy in the novel can also indicate the economic effects of Margaret Thatcher's neo-liberal regime in 1989, the time Ishiguro wrote his novel: the privatization of public utilities, the partial removal of state regulations, the promise of a problem-solver free market, the tax decrease for rich people and the disempowerment of trade unions (McCombe 2002: 79).

Mr Stevens epitomises the ordinary witness to the great transitions in human history, along with their major political and socio-economic changes. In hindsight, he struggles to ignore the dreadful fact that he was also a cog in a Nazi machine in the making by deciding to follow the orders of a very naive Lord Darlington: "And when today one hears talk about his lordship, when one hears the sort of foolish speculations concerning his motives [...] I for one will never doubt that a desire to see 'justice in this world' lay at the heart of all his actions" (Ishiguro 1989: 73).

The peace treaty at the end of the WWI led to controversial attitudes toward the Allies in Germany, hence the seeming necessity of the first international conference held by Lord Darlington in 1923:

By the turn of 1922, his lordship was working with a clear goal in mind. This was to gather under the very roof of Darlington Hall the most influential of the gentlemen whose support had been won with a view to conducting an "unofficial" international conference – a conference that would discuss the means by which the harshest terms of the Versailles treaty could be revised. To be worthwhile, any such conference would have to be of sufficient weight so that it could have a decisive effect on the "official" international conferences – several of which had already taken place with the express purpose of reviewing the treaty, but which had succeeded in producing only confusion and bitterness. (Ishiguro 1989: 75)

The financial struggles in the German families were a reflection of the country's post-war economic struggle. All war expenses had ended up in big debts, preventing Germany from complying with the Treaty of Versailles, which had imposed after-war repairs. Because of the economic challenges they had to face after the war (menial jobs, hard labour, daily pressure, lack of outside assistance, loss of individual and collective pride and autonomy), the Germans desperately needed a system that could promise rapid economic growth.

That is how Hitler and the Nazis rose quickly to power, and how Lord Darlington, like the rest of the world, was fooled by their apparently good intentions:

The fact is, the most established, respected ladies and gentlemen in England were availing themselves of the hospitality of the German leaders, and I can vouch at first hand that the great majority of these persons were returning with nothing but praise and admiration for their hosts. Anyone who implies that Lord Darlington was liaising covertly with a known enemy is just conveniently forgetting the true climate of those times. (Ishiguro 1989: 137)

Having Germany's best interests at heart, Mr Stevens' employer thought he might implicitly tend to England's own problems during the Great Depression in the early 1930s, hence his abominable liaison with the leader of the English Fascists, Sir Oswald Mosley.

Lord Darlington's wrong decisions redefine his good nature: In 1923, he decided to host an international conference at Darlington Hall. In the early 1930s, he decided to embrace the doctrine of the English fascists as well as the German cause and anti-Semitic policies.

In the same vein, Mr Stevens refuses to acknowledge his true love for Miss Kenton; to spend time with his dying father during the international conference at Darlington Hall; to oppose the firing of the Jewish servants, thus warning his employer of the abhorring consequences of Fascism and Anti-Semitism.

As with Lord Darlington's wrong political choices, Mr Stevens' choices turn him into a monster, one the world should be afraid of yet it is not, as Ishiguro himself says in an interview:

I'm reminded of something Lettie says in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*: "Monsters come in all shapes and sizes. Some of them are things people are scared of. Some of them are things that look like things people used to be scared of a long time ago. Sometimes monsters are things people should be scared of, but they aren't." I thought that last category was really interesting. What are the monsters that stand for things that we should be afraid of but we aren't? (Mason 1989: 336)

It is in human nature to be afraid of being hurt or of taking full responsibility for one's choices, decisions and actions, so the natural temptation is to run away from whatever one cannot fully understand or control. It is therefore also in human nature to choose the easiest path – it becomes too tiring to be constantly vigilant (Rushdie 1981: 193–195).

Mr Stevens could be the embodiment of any human being, even the author himself, as Ishiguro admits in the same interview:

Creating an incredibly stuffy English butler in *The Remains of the Day*, I was very aware that I was taking something that I recognised to be a very small, negative set of impulses in myself—the fear of getting hurt in love, or that urge to just say, "I don't want to figure out the political implications or the moral implications of my job, I'm just going to get on with my tiny patch"; those kinds of little urges we all recognise in ourselves—taking those and exaggerating them, and turning them into a kind of monstrous manifestation. The butler doesn't look like a conventional monster, but I always thought that he was a kind of monster. (Mason 1989: 336)

Mr Stevens' personal life does not matter when it comes to preserving his professional dignity. He seems to reflect on his lost opportunities, when in fact he is still interested in the implications of his professional connections. *Persona* means wearing social masks, but Mr Stevens' masks seem to be his only identity. His past choices are as irreversible as Lord Darlington's, although by far more innocent. However, both the employer and the employee are victims of their past decisions.

A wasted life is like a bad joke, or rather like failed banter. Old Mr Stevens knows this best. However strong self-interest may be when underlying economic affairs and professional ties, human behaviour lacks cold-hearted rationality most times.

4. HOMO HEURISTICUS

According to Eric D. Beinhocker, "[a]t the core of any economic theory, there must be a theory of human behaviour. Economies are ultimately made up of people" (2006: 87). Like the modern economist, Ishiguro, too, believes that the only knowledge that man will always need most is self-knowledge, since human nature will always remain a multifaceted and mysterious reality in its entirety.

The concept of ecological rationality stands for the importance of the environment in the decision-making process, determining what type of heuristic is appropriate for each real-life situation to help people transmute their preferences into practical choices (Gigerenzer 2008: 21).

Heuristics are thus practical instruments that can simplify the decision-making process in environments that exhibit uncertainty, limited information and bounded rationality.

There are basically two approaches to heuristics, coming from two behavioural schools, which mainly differ by showing whether heuristics are biased or unbiased:

- a. Fast and frugal heuristics (Gigerenzer/Brighton 2009:109)
- b. Biases and heuristics (Tversky/Kahneman 1974: 1127)

While the second school views heuristics as errors of judgement that indicate human irrationality and lead to biases in the decision-making process, Gigerenzer states that the decisions taken under the fast and frugal heuristics are perfectly rational from an ecological point of view. Thus, he acknowledges the adaptive nature of heuristics, which can prove effective problem solvers in most types of environment.

The Remains of the Day is both directly and indirectly based on these behavioural realities, with deep psychological, social, political and economic implications. The mental multiverses that Ishiguro creates within his characters could lead to the unexpected analogy with the term *diorama*, precisely because they convey the idea of three-dimensionality, meant to give the illusion of reality.

Thus, the causality and implications of the decision-making process in *The Remains of the Day*, like in any other literary work, can have the therapeutic role of a diorama: The three-dimensional full-size or miniature model of reality within the confines of the novel can give readers a bird's eye view of their own lives. The scale to which this

mental show is drawn may not necessarily be relevant, since the physical reality itself seems a mere illusion, according to many writers and scientists alike. In other words, life itself is a huge (yet finite) mental diorama: Everyone sees something else, according to their own individuality!

Therefore, *The Remains of the Day* can also embody what the economist Robert Shiller has coined as *Narrative Economy*: "Narratives are human constructs that are mixtures of fact and emotion and human interest and other extraneous detail that form an impression on the human mind. [They] have the ability to produce social norms that partially govern our activities, including our economic actions" (Shiller 2017: 1).

Through characters like Mr Stevens and Miss Kenton, Ishiguro accepts the importance of the irrational in the healthy configuration of life, with its implications for every area of human thought, thus glorifying the relationship between intuition and reason. Since at the base of the individual and collective cognition are not only the intellectual processes, but also the irrational subconscious desires, the novel thus proves the complexity of the intellect, which consists of more than the logical determination of beliefs and opinions.

In the same vein, Lovejoy speaks of a Copernican revolution of ideas: The rational man is no longer the centre of the intellectual system, just as the Earth is no longer considered the centre of the planetary system (1940: 18).

That is why the understanding of the invisible hand in *The Remains of the Day* cannot be an exclusively logical process, in which the objective truth is presented progressively, in a rational order. Its reality is shaped by the interference of many other factors, belonging to literature, psychology, sociology, politics, economics and game theory, since all these fields entail human interconnection, be it sincere or not. For this reason, no way of thinking is entirely true or false, no decision-making process can be considered completely wrong or inspired.

Complex as it is, *The Remains of the Day* could heal its readers of most of the conflicting feelings they themselves may be experiencing, which no psychologist could successfully reconfigure. It would not be wrong, then, to say that Ishiguro's novel tells the story of human nature, with the exigencies and vicissitudes of the physical experience, as Mr Stevens perceives it in his biased mind.

Therefore, besides its economic meaning, the invisible hand in *The Remains of the Day*, shaky as it might be, could very well indicate the complexity of human nature, whose conscious and unconscious features and acquisitions do not occupy well-defined percentages, but form a sort of organic melting pot.

A behavioural economic understanding of the invisible hand can help readers accept the characters in *The Remains of the Day* for who they are; and, by doing so, they will also accept their own imperfections in order to make the sincerest decisions in all aspects of their lives, not just in their daily economic transactions. A biased invisible hand may actually mean that the drive of interconnection is not faulty but realistic. All people, real or fictional, use heuristics and biases in their decision-making process.

For instance, Mr Stevens frequently uses the representativeness heuristic: he strongly believes that if something is more representative, then it is also more likely to be the truth. A good example is his belief in the true origins of any great butler: "It is sometimes said that butlers only truly exist in England. Other countries, whatever title is actually used, have only manservants. I tend to believe this is true" (Ishiguro 1989: 43).

Is Mr Stevens, or is he not, a great butler?

When he is mistaken for a gentleman, in Moscombe, he chooses to remain perceived that way and hurries to bed when Dr Carlisle wants to speak to him about the socio-political affairs he has boasted about having been part of (Liquori 2008: 26).

In most cases, the representativeness heuristic will lead Mr Stevens to correct thinking, hence his impeccable professional behaviour. However, in deciding to trust his employer's decisions at all times on grounds of social hierarchy, he unwillingly accepts the stereotyping bias. That would better explain his accepting Lord Darlington's decision to fire the two Jewish employees:

Miss Kenton, let me suggest to you that you are hardly well placed to be passing judgements of such high and mighty nature. The fact is, the world of today is a very complicated and treacherous place. There are many things you and I are simply not in a position to understand concerning, say, the nature of Jewry. Whereas his lordship, I might venture, is somewhat better placed to judge what is for the best. (Ishiguro 1989: 149)

One of the biases prevalent in main characters' behaviour and decision-making process is the confirmation bias. Once the characters have formed a belief, they consciously or unconsciously search for information that confirms that belief while ignoring or rejecting anything that may prove them wrong.

That may better explain Miss Kenton's genuine wonder at finding that the rational Mr Stevens can actually find secret pleasure in reading romantic books; or Lord Darlington's blind trust in the Nazi doctrine despite the repeated warnings coming from various sources at different times; or Mr Stevens' decision to prove his father that he is a great butler by doing his job while his father was dying. In other words, they all do everything in their power, at a subconscious level, to make their intuitive decisions concur with their rational counterparts.

The confirmation bias and the representativeness heuristic can also explain why Mr Stevens, seemingly the most rational person there is, according to Adam Smith's standards, cannot ever change.

The peak-end rule indicates how the retrospection of life can change the whole understanding of certain experiences (Kahneman/Riis 2005: 287). A past event can be re-experienced mentally over and over again, often leading to contradictory choices and decisions. It may be regarded as a bias, yet these new perceptions of past circumstances and events can also help people see parts of their lives with new eyes and therefore learn valuable life lessons.

The same seems to be the case with Mr Stevens when he denies on different occasions that he has known Lord Darlington. Although he does not admit it openly, his atypical behaviour screams, "I wish I had never served my former employer."

In the last chapter, however, he admits that his heart is breaking only to decide a little later that he will have to learn the American way of bantering to please his new employer. In behavioural economics, this can be regarded as a fusion of three biases: status quo, endowment effect and sunk cost. Old Mr Stevens does not want to become an ordinary man, so he decides to stick to his professional status for whatever remains

of his day, so to speak (status quo). By doing so, he proves that he still overvalues his professional life to the detriment of his personal life (endowment effect) and, although he eventually acknowledges his past losses, he decides to continue to invest his time and energy in a career with little personal benefits (sunk cost).

However, Mr Stevens realises the price he has already paid for what is called opportunity cost in economics: the loss of all the other opportunities when one particular choice is made. At the end of the day he still chooses profession over personal life, reason over emotion, because he thinks he has no other choice: "I've given what I had to give. I gave it all to Lord Darlington."

Mr Stevens has given up the value of family in order to choose greatness in his profession, when the two could, in fact, complement each other with conscious effort or, at least, could replace each other at the right moment. Miss Kenton is the perfect example in this respect: She is an obvious representative of intuitive and emotional thinking, yet that did not stop her either from being a true professional, when she worked as a housekeeper at Darlington Hall, or from having a happy family life afterwards.

Why is Mr Stevens incapable of being anything else but a great butler? His inability could be explained through the availability heuristic, which refers to the decisions made after immediate examples, also called salient exemplars. Mr Stevens has got one salient exemplar when it comes to a butler's greatness: his father. So it is easily deducible that all he does in his professional life, the only one he knows, is to impress his father, even if that means to act inhumanely in the housekeeper's eyes: "Miss Kenton, please don't think me unduly improper in not ascending to see my father in his deceased condition just at this moment. You see, I know my father would have wished me to carry on just now" (Ishiguro 1989: 106).

5. A GAME THEORETICAL APPROACH

Since the invisible hand underlies both types of social interaction – cooperation and competition – it can still be the mankind's only recipe for welfare, as Smith once believed: People's healthy interests could complement each other so that the puzzle of humankind will never have any missing or misplaced pieces. The success of Smith's invisible hand is therefore conditioned by cooperation, driven by correct self-interest, mutual trust and respect. However, as Smith himself also stated, corrupt practices and interests will always turn win-win situations into what game theory calls zero-sum games. In other words, each participant's gains and losses are influenced by the other participants' choices and decisions: one's gains are the other's losses.

Owing to its mathematical ability to explain all manifestations of the decision-making process, where participants' payoffs influence each other, game theory is used in most fields, from economics and political sciences to biology, military tactics and psychology. Moreover, it has been successfully applied to literature before, one interesting example being the analysis of the intricate interactions in Jane Austen's novels (Chwe 2014: 4). Strategic interaction, whether in real life or in fiction, is mainly based on Nash equilibrium, which constitutes the best set of decisions made by the participants in either cooperative or competitive games, regardless of what the other participants might choose to do.

In *The Remains of the Day*, Lord Darlington's choices and decisions can be best explained through three strategic games: the prisoner's dilemma, the stag-hunt game and the zero-sum game.

The prisoner's dilemma is a paradoxical situation in which two self-interested prisoners choose a seemingly safer, yet not optimal, solution due to mistrust in the other participant. Therefore, they end up in a worse situation than if their decisions had been based on cooperation. In other words, the prisoners' cooperation, which means not confessing to their crime, would bring them less years to serve in prison, so it seems like the best option. Nevertheless, they both find Nash equilibrium in defecting, or confessing to their crime, for the sole reason that they think the other would certainly betray them.

The stag hunt game is also a game of either cooperation or competition, described first by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in which the players could either hunt a stag together or each hunt a hare. Unlike the prisoner's dilemma, the stag hunt has two Nash equilibria: cooperation and defection.

Unlike the previous two, the zero-sum game is strictly a competitive strategy, in which one participant wins while the other loses so that the sum of payoffs is always zero.

Lord Darlington is unwittingly dragged into these three strategic games, played very consciously by his political allies. What the American senator Mr Lewis calls naivety is, in fact, Lord Darlington's sincere desire to make Smith's invisible hand work in political and socio-economic affairs, either nationally or internationally.

Lord Darlington's death is an extreme case of zero-sum game, in which the player's bad reputation adds to the losses suffered in the stag-hunt game (the outcome of the conference in 1923) and the prisoner's dilemma game (the betrayal of the German ambassador and the true meaning of the Nazi doctrine and anti-Semitism): "His lordship sincerely believed he would get justice. Instead [...] his lordship's good name was destroyed for ever. [...] afterwards, well, his lordship was virtually invalid. [...] It really was most tragic to see" (Ishiguro 1989: 235).

As it turns out, Mr Lewis is right in criticising Lord Darlington's amateur idealism at the 1923 conference. Subsequent events prove how unprepared Lord Darlington actually was for participating in such complicated strategic games along with seasoned diplomats, who would easily choose between cooperation and betrayal. Unlike the book, the movie *The Remains of the Day* goes a step further by rewarding Mr Lewis for being maybe the only fair player in the stag-hunt game of the 1923 conference, in the sense that he is also the American buyer of Darlington Hall after Lord Darlington's death.

6. THE PROSPECT THEORY

The purpose of presenting the characters' choices and decisions from multiple perspectives was to prove that the world's politics, as well as economies, do ultimately stem from people's choices and decisions. What would then be the best explanation for the failure of the invisible hand in *The Remains of the Day* as in real life?

In an ideal world, the one envisaged by Adam Smith, people under unbounded rationality would be able to maximise their benefits while minimising their costs at

all times. Thus, they would be able to have access to all information available, know all potential consequences or outcomes and unemotionally choose the most satisfactory alternatives or options.

Mr Stevens has all the qualities of a maximiser, and, if there were many people like him, they would certainly render the invisible hand feasible, regardless of the period they lived in:

[...] a butler's duty is to provide good service. It is not to meddle in the great affairs of the nation. The fact is, such great affairs will always be beyond the understanding of those such as you and I, and those of us who wish to make our mark must realize that we best do so by concentrating on what is within our realm; that is to say, by devoting our attention to providing the best possible service to those great gentlemen in whose hands the destiny of civilization truly lies. (Ishiguro 1989: 199)

However, scientific studies indicate that human beings seem incapable of long-term cooperation, trust and fair exchange of goods and services (Sutherland/Rainbird 2000: 189–209; King *et al.* 2009: 261–285). According to the prospect theory, in behavioural economics, people are risk-averse only in relation to gains, and risk-seekers when they have to face losses (Kahneman/Tversky 1979: 267). Thus, while conventional economics sees people as risk-averse at all times, if they cannot see acceptable advantages for taking risks, the phenomenon of loss aversion, connected to the prospect theory, proves that people are ready to take risks in order to avoid probable losses, therefore their choices and decisions will be irrational and impulsive most times, rendering the invisible hand shaky and biased.

Another explanation of cooperation failure could be the chaos theory. The collective mind is a very sensitive system and, by extension, so is the entire physical world. Therefore, one individual mind can create the very small change that will make the whole system behave uncontrollably. This phenomenon is called the butterfly effect: small choices and decisions will almost always have large effects. A person's actions can therefore influence the socio-economic and political advance of a country and, ultimately, of the whole world (Cambel 1993: 46–78).

This, in turn, comes to prove that the whole will always be "something else than the sum of its parts" (Koffka 1999: 176).

REFERENCES

- Beinhocker, E. D. 2006. *The Origin of Wealth: The Radical Remaking of Economics and What It Means for Business and Society*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Cambel, A. B. 1993. *Applied Chaos Theory: A Paradigm for Complexity*. New York: Academic Press.
- Chwe, M. S. Y. 2014. *Jane Austen: Game Theorist*. Princeton UP.
- Gigerenzer, G. 2008. Moral Intuition = Fast and Frugal Heuristics? In W. Sinnott-Armstrong (ed.) *Moral Psychology 2. The Cognitive Science of Morality: Intuition and Diversity*. Boston: MIT Press, 1–26.

- Gigerenzer, G. and H. Brighton. 2009. Homo Heuristicus: Why Biased Mind Make Better Inferences. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 1, 107–143.
- Hutcheon, L. 1988. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York: Penguin.
- Ishiguro, K. 1989. *The Remains of the Day*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Kahneman, D. and J. Riis. 2005. Living, and Thinking about It: Two Perspectives on Life. *The Science of Well-Being* 3(7), 285–304.
- Kahneman, D. and A. Tversky. 1979. Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. *Econometrica* 47(2), 263–291.
- King, E. B., M. R. Hebl and D. J. Daniel. 2009. Conflict and Cooperation in Diverse Workgroups. *Journal of Social Issues* 65(2), 261–285.
- Koffka, K. 1999. *Principles of Gestalt Psychology*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Levinas, E. 1969. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP.
- Lewis, B. 2001. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. Manchester: Manchester UP.
- Liquori, D. 2008. Texture of Memory: Ishiguro Finds in the Fog of Recollection a Device to Craft Novels. *Contemporary Novelists* 6(2), 26.
- Lovejoy, A. O. 1940. Reflections on the History of Ideas. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 1(1), 3–23.
- Mason, G. 1989. An Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro. *Contemporary Literature* 3(3), 336.
- McCombe, J. P. 2002. End of Anthony Eden: Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* and Mid-century Anglo-American Tensions. *Twentieth-Century Literature* 48(1), 77–99.
- Rushdie, S. 1981. *Kazuo Ishiguro. Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism*. London: Viking.
- Shiller, R. J. 2017. Narrative Economics. *American Economic Review* 107(4), 967–1004.
- Smith, A. 2009. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Blacksburg, VA: Thrifty Books.
- Strauch, R. 1999. *The Reality Illusion: How You Make the World You Experience*. Amazon Digital Services LLC: KDP Print US.
- Sutherland, J. and H. Rainbird. 2000. *Unions and Workplace Learning: Conflict or Cooperation with the Employer*. London: Palgrave.
- Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman. 1974. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science* 185(4157), 1124–1131.
- Vorda, A. and K. Herzinger. 1994. Stuck on the Margins: An Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro. In A. Vorda (ed.) *Face to Face: Interviews with Contemporary Novelists*. Houston: Rice University Press, 25.
- Wren, C. 1996. *Industrial Subsidies: The UK Experience*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan UK.

SUMMARY

THE INVISIBLE HAND IN *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY*

The modern economist Eric D. Beinhocker rightly states that economies stem from people's choices and decisions.

The miniature model of reality within the confines of any fiction book could offer a bird's eye view of the decision-making process. This is what the English writer of Japanese origins Kazuo Ishiguro indirectly proves in his third novel, *The Remains of the Day*, which thus gives a literary answer to a question all economists, past and present, have asked themselves at least once: Why is *the invisible hand* concept, proposed by the father of modern economics Adam Smith, so unfeasible in the real world?

KEYWORDS: Kazuo Ishiguro, *The Remains of the Day*, the invisible hand, behavioural economics, heuristics, game theory, the prospect theory, interdisciplinary.

ARTICLE INFO:

Original research article

Received: June 15, 2020

Revised: July 1, 2020

Accepted: October 2, 2020