

## Political party – gerotoharm in politics

In the past, political parties were leading soldiers who drove away monarchy.

During the civil revolution period, when conflicts among the citizens tend to be hard, political parties represented and adjusted the interests of each occupation and region.

In society where "occupation" and "provinces" were strong and there was little awareness as "people in nation", the philosophy of political parties was a banner that collectively reflected the will of the people in national politics.

However, political parties were also organizations of wealthy citizens to cooperate to fight against the monarchy for their profits.

Current political parties take over such history, coupled with supply-side-oriented economic policies, are mainly backed up by big companies and rather wealthy people. And less affluent people, the consumption side, and companies that are not big are easily alienated from politics.

The Communist Party, which was able to compete with traditional political parties for less affluent citizens, declared a one-party dictatorship, and made the party members privileged citizens.

Banning the existence of political party is violation of freedom of association and is fault.

However, allowing political parties to work in polity and to affect the person in polity is wrong.

Political parties become anti-democratic by working like "de facto" public institutions.

Political party has changed to a system that distorts the will of people and suppresses the replacement of opinion leaders.

The restraint of party decision to member of legislative distorts the will of people, for instance as follows.

There are three political parties in the Diet, 150 members of the A party, 100 members of the B party, and 40 members of the C party. A bill is proposed there. 90 of the A-party's members are in favor and 60 are against. Similarly, in party B, 20 people are in favor and 80 are against. In party C, 15 people are in favor and 25 are against. If lawmakers can express their opinions individually, 125 in favor and 165 against will reject the bill. However, if the party restraint works, all 150 members of the A party must vote in favor, all 100 members of the B party and all 40 members of the C party will vote against it, and the tax will go up by a majority of 150 to 140. Can we say that this is a parliament that reflects the will of the people?

There might be a counterargument saying "It's OK by that because current people vote for the political party, not for the assembly (individual member)".

But political parties make pledge and manifest about many issues, not about one.

For example, it will package income security for farmers, restraint of inflation with regard to monetary policy, postponing consumption tax increase, and allowing the budget increase in national defense.

The pledge package is formed through various tactics and adjustments among factions within a party, and do not necessarily come in the way that the people really need. The people (voters) are only given the choice of whether to accept this package or not. When I agree to mild inflation, oppose to budget increase in national defense and wants to postpone consumption tax, it would be no problem if all of them were in one party's pledge. But otherwise, I have to vote for a party that agrees with a policy which I think most important. However, there is no guarantee the pledge that I considered most important will be most important to the party. If the priority of the policy in the party is low, it can be

left behind.

And such a package can be poisoned.

In the 1930s, German people voted for the Nazis who advocated "job creation" and "unity of legislative and administrative", Nazis was therefore able to realize the latter. They can gain the support of people on the policy that should be doughted through procedure of election because it is packaged with good bait in political pledge.

In addition, the tyranny of political party by such packaging also harms the "thiking power of each person" which is the foundation of democracy.

General public who have been too limited in their political choices will give up their political judgment and act with a shallow idea that "after all, professional politicians will do as they think, so just give me something" rather than evaluate political issues from multiple perspectives.

Individual legislators who are overwhelmed by the dynamics within the political party will come to give opinions that will enhance their position in the party, and will be less focused on social problems and refining their ability to formulate policies from them.

In order to make democratic system practical, the voices of the periphery must be reflected in the policy. It is against democracy that voices in central are over respected and easy to form a political majority.

It is usual there are more population of the peripheries than of the central. However, the people in the periphery are separated each other. There is no recognition of common interests. In comparison, people in the central are easier to unify their intentions for the common good. When they are in a position to manipulate information, they can even induce periphery. And political party is useful tool for it.

It is said that fascism seized power from the bottom in Germany and from above in Japan before World War II. In any case, private groups outside the polity (parliament, government, and courts) eroded the regime. That was the Nazi In Germany, and the association of military personnel in Japan. They became a central majority by forming political party or becoming military personnel. This majority easily deprived the democratic system (which should protect the interests of the minorities in periphery) and shifted to dictatorship.

Currently, at least in developed countries, military personnel are restrained from politics.

But political parties remain in free activity. This should be called a kind of insanity of civilian control.

Democratic system cannot help taking majority vote as means of decision making. The rightfulness or validity of this means is ensured only by the presence of independent and equal voting members. Also it is important that all of the decision-takers share information, are free to change their opinions in discussions, and are not guided by profits. We need participants free from authoritative thinking and think as possible as rationally, flexibly in the process of political judgment. When such voters try to seek the right solution, the dialogue and majority vote approach the correct answer. This is the phase democracy is working.

Conversely, If some people have organizational collusion or back-door transactions in the process, the fair decision and will of the people are distorted. Actually, the "organization of some people" is a political party.

In addision, political parties themselves are also likely to fall into disfunction.

The big parties attract groups who want to ride the winning horse. When their interests conflict, the inside of the political party will be subdivided. There is no control by the philosophy of the political party, just remains hard push of the factions or party which cannot decide.

Especially, the "two party system" risks deepening social divisions by bringing the differences in interests between the people into politics in a way that makes it stand out more.

Political party accelerates the risk of mobocracy.

The era when it was effective to unite under the banner of political philosophy has passed. We need a system realize the harmony beyond the word of political philosophy .

But we are clinging to the unreliable political pledge of parties that can visualize the amount of supporters.

It is a habit in thought of modern people who attach great values to the result for the time that make us think "If only a part of the society can be made a cohesive group, the entire society will be able to be put together eventually".

We should not emphasize the association of some people, but the procedure of agreement involving all people. These two are completely different.

The fact that people's opinion can be reflected in the Diet without political party is proven by various bills such as the "Act on the Prevention of Abuse of Persons with Disabilities" which were settled by argument unrelated to political party.

If the sudden speech of individual members at plenary session is confusing, the committee may examine it first. But there should not be any partisan rule.

Restraint for lawmakers by resolution of political party should be prohibited at vote in confessional, indeed.

Political party influences its member and the society greatest in election campaign. It can also be said that political parties dominate politics through elections.

The political party in power has the funds of donation from major corporate groups. By it, the voters who do not have a political opinion especially can be taken in, and the candidates can be guided. In this way, political parties can take the appearance as if they reflected the will of the people, even if they actually reflected only the will of the group with common profit. And hidden rule by boss of political party (or faction) continues.

Conversely, if the democratization of election system is promoted, hidden rule by political parties will be reduced.

For example, election funding subsidy for political parties from the government should be abolished. Because the money comes from tax collected from all citizens should not be used for a particular group. It can be called even the infringement of right to vote and equality in election.

All elections should be in the form of individual selection, and proportional election basing on political party should also be abolished.

We should also limit electoral activities (especially of political parties' ) and ensure the election system which does not cost big money (see below).

It can be said that the discussion about the election system was overlooked because the political party had taken charge of the election system well (to be their own profit) up to now, and the democratization of the election did not advance.

No revolution or coup is needed to realize such politics.

If the "last party" which advocates the abolition of party politics as its first pledge take power through election, it will be done.