

Deliberative Tournament Elections: An answer to reduce seeds of terrorism in the world

0. Summary

In Deliberative Tournament Elections (DTE or Bottom-up Elections), participating voters hold “Small Meetings” by forming 30-membered groups for face-to-face discussion, and elect 3 or 10% of either political candidates or final voters by voting in each group. At every Small Meeting, they discuss current issues, future vision, potential solutions and images or qualifications of ideal leaders with assistance by trained facilitators.

Those elected by the first tier of group discussions form 30-membered groups to have Small Meetings respectively at the second tier, and in each group they elect 3 members again as candidates or final voters. Deliberative discussion will be repeated by a number of tiers of 30-membered groups until the required number of politicians can be elected. All participating voters in the same groups as the final politicians’ will be Advisers to the elected during their term. If 3/4 of the Advisers say “No!” to a politician in service during the term, one must step down.

In case DTE is implemented, voters will gain benefits of Deliberative Democracy by overcoming the following problems of the current election systems prevailing in the world.

- 1) No one can tell whether ballot counting is accurately conducted. (None can see all counting.)
- 2) The effect of reciprocal dealings between candidates and influential groups often overrides the intentions of individual voters. (Reciprocal dealings or bribes largely influence the decisions of voters particularly in the developing world.)
- 3) Opinions of the individual voters without influential power have no chances to be heard.
- 4) Simple voting is against human nature of the people wishing to learn, network and exchange ideas with one another to improve the political economy of the region, the country and the world.
- 5) Candidates need too much sacrifice, time and money for preparation and promotion.
- 6) Surprises and gossips reported by media over-influence the voters in decision- makings.
- 7) The voters tend to take the short-term perspective rather than the long-term.
- 8) Frustrations accumulate due to one-way top-down management in politics, amounting to one of the root causes for terrorism.
- 9) Politicians in service must use substantial time & money for self-promotion rather than jobs in public offices.
- 10) The current prevailing election system has a logical problem. For instance in case one candidate stresses “Economy” as an agenda, and the other “Education” as a policy, voters must compare apples and oranges.

1. Why a New System for Elections?

The modern election system prevailing in the world is based on the outdated concept of governance or management 150 or more years ago, namely too much one-way “Top-Down” neglecting potentials of the general public. Those days, there were just a limited number of the elite males with voting rights, and a limited number of industrial sectors e.g. agriculture, commerce, manufacturing, transportation and constructions.

However, in today’s world, the general public except those in a limited number of the developing countries are quite highly educated with diversified jobs in various industries, engaging much developed technologies. Accordingly, today’s politicians should establish and implement policies based on good understandings on international finance and economies, advanced technologies, complex international relations and diplomacy etc. not to mention all the industrial sectors.

In politics, overall optimization through good understandings across different sectors is a key for good administration of the government.

DTE can take advantage of all the strengths of modern management, namely “All participate”, “Bottom-Up”, and “Kaizen(use of PDCA: Plan, Do, Check, and Act)” through “Small Meetings” which will enable good communications face-to-face throughout the societies, thereby realizing the ideal “Democracy of the People, by the People and for the People”, by upgrading politics into Kenzen (sound) status by imbedded “Kaizen” process.

(Note: At the “Small Meetings”, the participants are allowed to talk, discuss, and exchange ideas, thereby minimizing the frustrations of individuals assisted by facilitators who went through professional training. Small Meetings held repeatedly is a source of power to minimize one of the root causes for terrorism, i.e. accumulated frustrations due to neglects and ignorance on small individuals in politics.)

2. Outline of Deliberative Tournament Elections (DTE or Bottom-up elections)

DTE (Deliberative Tournament Elections or Bottom-up Elections) is a newly suggested election system which incorporates concepts of Deliberative Democracy into National or Regional Elections of respective countries, thereby creating opportunities of face-to-face discussion/life-long learning among all the voters including candidates, and enhancing ideas to improve the societies through Bottom-up Approach and networking of the participating voters, whereas in the current election systems by simple voting, the results are often influenced by superficial information, e.g. gossips, appearance of candidates, and articles by certain magazines.

DTE will enhance engagement of voters through in-depth group discussions in order to develop and

elect good leaders with hands-on experience in the fields of business administration of organizations with adequate knowledge on science & technologies. Accordingly potentially excellent leaders including those quite modest, unaggressive at self-promotion could be elected for a community, a region or a country, and even at a school.

In DTE, voters will form groups respectively of 30 members in which in-depth discussions are held on current situation, issues and problems, potential solutions and policies, ideal images of leaders and qualifications. After the discussions, each group elects 10% or total 3 members as candidates or final voters by voting after presentations and Q & A by the candidates.

To be political candidates, they have to submit true resume, motives, and evidences to the Election Committee of the region. No fee is necessary to become a candidate because all the steps to elect a leader(s) will be the same irrespective of the number of politicians to be elected.

The respective facilitators, a lead facilitator and an assistant facilitator in each group, will be officials, citizens, teachers, and university students, all of whom went through facilitation training for this purpose to understand Kaizen and Kenzen concepts together with benefits of Small Meetings.

Those once elected will get together again to form respectively 30-membered groups, and each group elects 3 members as candidates of politicians or final voters through the same process as in the first tier of 30-membered groups.

Table 1: Small Meeting program for deliberative discussion

	Main role taken by	Programs
1	Facilitator(s)	Explanation/Q & A on Methodologies (Deliberative discussion) and code of ethics
2	Participants	Introductions by all the participants
3	Officials or volunteers	Discussion on current status and issues (Common for all Small Meetings) and Q & A Issues to be raised by participants and Q & A
4	Participants	Discussion on directions and policies (Small Group Discussion → Summary)
Recess (Free discussion)		
5	Participants	Required capacities to leaders (Small Group Discussion → Summary)
6	Election committee	Confirmation of resume & qualifications of all the candidates in the group
7	Candidates	Speeches and Q & A by all candidates
Recess (Free discussion)		
8	Participants	Voting by 30 members (Choose top 3 by several rounds)
9	Candidates	Speeches and Q & A by all candidates elected
10	Participants	Confirm requests to the elected
Recess (Free discussion)		
	Note: Candidates are all as politicians or final voters	

If 12,000 candidates run for a leader, DTE can come up with 1,200 candidates after the first tier of Small Meetings, 120 after the second tier, and then the final one after total three tiers of group discussions. As far as places for the Small Meetings can be arranged, three days of group discussions at many places will come up with just one leader.

During the election period, many restaurants and meeting rooms at hotels, and city council or school buildings will be full of participating voters with ideas and opinions for implementation to improve the society, the region and the country. After the respective election at each discussion room, all the voting participants enjoy themselves to celebrate their peaceful meeting with songs and dramas, thereby creating local communities encompassing different jobs and generations.

When politicians solve problems, they tend to deal with laws and regulations with additional budget, but when citizens discuss issues, they could come up with solutions without political intervention nor a budget, thereby realizing smaller public spending than otherwise.

When a final one is elected as a leader or a mayor by DTE, all the voters within the same groups as the final one will be Advisers or evaluators during the service period (term) of the leader. All of them belong to an Advisory Committee to evaluate the leader's performance every half a year.

(They do see the job performances/values, but not issues of personal life as some gossip magazines.)

If 3 quarters of the Advisers say "No!" to the leader, one has to step down. To appoint a new leader, those in the final group will get together and elect the substitute from the final group. In case, it is close to the end of the term, DTE will be conducted from the beginning. (Recall System)

(The number of Advisers could be less than 200, even though a political leader needs to go through 5 times of Small Meetings, to be elected.)

Deliberative discussion at the Small Meetings could be time consuming learning experience, possibly for several hours, and objective-oriented for problem solving in the society. Therefore, even one is elected from the first tier of a Small Meeting as a candidate or a final voter, one can be proud of oneself. If a mother, a father or a school teacher is elected even one time, their children will be impressed and ask many questions. "Why and how were you elected?" "What kind of discussions did you have?" "How many in the group voted you?" "What policies did you suggest?" etc.

3. Needs and logics to improve the current election systems

In the current election systems either indirect or direct, all the candidates use time and money for marketing & sales by fliers, banners, meetings, supporting staff. etc. unless they are well known celebrities, etc. in media, and most badly, some candidates establish inappropriate relations with influential groups to take short cut to winning. These relations often include unfair reciprocal dealings with specific business sectors, etc. unknown to general voters, making politics unable to realize overall optimization in the long-term.

To date, candidates participate in various regional events to make themselves known for future elections, without engaging themselves in any proper business or public service. That kind of preparation time in the current election system requires the candidates to recover the invested time and money after they get elected, without being noticed by the general public.

In Japan, many candidates stand at stations and make a speech to sell their faces, but most commuters do not listen even for 5 seconds. In fact, all show-off activities are considered to mislead the public because no discussion with Q & A is possible.

Contents of flyers are just political slogans and images. The capabilities to produce flyers and its contents cannot be considered as good measures for selecting candidates. This is because in the current highly developed complex societies, important factors for politicians should not be what issues they will deal with, but how they will deal with those issues, i.e. employment, industries, health care, diplomacy, defense, education and culture, etc. But in the current simple election systems, voters cannot have in-depth discussions.

A problematic case is that even though the government cannot have financially positive balance in the revenue and public spending on the long term, candidates with sweet words can attract voters. As a result, many politicians can be those without hands-on experience in industries and organization management, but good producers of sweet words, because those with hands-on experience know things are not that easy and consider that deeper discussions and studies would be necessary to cope with the problems.

During the election period, political candidates try to see trends of the public opinions and shout their own names as many and as loud as possible. Many of them do not know where they should take the people, but to win the election they try to identify the trends and follow them, which would lead to an easy-going route of a large budget, subsidies, military spending, etc.

As far as the current election system is maintained, no really good leaders who request the voters take necessary actions to improve the situation can win, but those to follow easy-going public will, because most voters have no chance to discuss problems in depth with others face-to-face in the

system.

Every time inappropriate case is found among politicians, voters are disappointed. But voters have no opportunity to find whether the candidates are Pied Piper of Hamelin or not. Moreover, those voters who have elected problematic politicians have no opportunity to say words of regret or apologies openly. This means that any PDCA cycle does not exist in the current system.

In the current election systems, voters' accumulated experience, ethical consideration, and diagnostic/ assessment capacities are just no use.

When general election got started in the olden time, experience and knowledge required by politics were just limited to agriculture, commerce, education, and laws. However, the modern politics requires much wider perspectives and deeper understandings than before, on complex issues e.g. global economy and industries, international relations, and highly developed technologies.

Mass media e.g. TV, radio, newspaper, journals, and internet news often seek high circulations and high rate of watchers, and may create sensations and even deform facts contrary to the real responsibilities of journalism. An example is Charlie Hebdo: a French satirical weekly magazine, which increased circulations more than 100 times by continuing controversial cartoons even after being attacked by terrorists in January 2015. They seem to fail to see that freedom of speech is only realized when respect to other religions or beliefs is maintained.

Rather than being based on second or indirect information via mass media, we voters should rely on our own judgments through face-to-face discussion at Small Meetings, particularly when we think of the current voters are much more educated than before.

In DTE, even when we make mistakes in our judgments, we can recall why we made a mistake and who voted who. If we can review and recall our process of misjudgments, we can apply Kaizen and use PDCA to improve our decisions even in politics.

The most important thing is that we mankind can grow, learn and acquire wisdom as far as we have our Kaizen (Continuous Improvement Process) and Kenzen (Sound) spirits.

Another reason why deliberative discussion at Small Meetings will lead us to better results is because mass media often set the intelligence level comparatively low to maximize circulations. On the other hand, deliberative discussion will enable the knowledgeable and experienced to contribute more than those without knowledge and experience, and the discussion will go to comparatively higher levels. Mass media lower a resultant Group IQ, whereas deliberative discussion will lead us to

higher Group IQ particularly when we have some appropriate facilitation.

DTE requires candidates to cover expenses of tea, coffee and snacks only at every Small Meeting up to USD10-20/day. The total can be USD30-50/day together if meals included, giving chances of more revenue to the local restaurants.

What if, a voter does not want to use even USD20/day for DTE?

The answer is one does not have to participate, not to mention those who make a decision based on superficial attributes including first impressions, candidates' appearances, school names etc.

Rather, those voters who want to study political economy, international relations, welfare, community management, etc. will take active part in DTE. DTE will create learning and networking opportunities among voters by enhancing communities in the modern society with widening differences in knowledge and technologies, thereby reducing the crime rate in respective regions.

In DTE, voting rate is not the first priority, but quality of decisions by the voters is of prime concern. The roles of media in DTE are not sensation makers, but they follow up and disseminate to the public discussed contents in each group.

We now take "Quality (contents)" rather than "Quantity (voting rate)" in DTE.

Every time inappropriate cases or scandals of politicians are found, many critics say voters must feel responsible because voters elected them. I say "No, because the modern election process has too many defects. Those critics neither know the real levels of individual voters once they have good intentions, and nor the power of deliberative democracy."

The current election system discourages many people including potentially ideal politicians, to become candidates because of its illogicalities.

4. Benefits of DTE

As far as the voters participate in discussions and elect their representatives in their own groups at the respective Small Meetings, they feel responsible and would take actions as necessary, through the established network via DTE.

If a leadership is supported in the market or the society through all those concerned to the top decision-makers, the results will be promising, just like large successful companies e.g. GE and Toyota. Additional positive impact by Bottom-up Approach combined with the conventional Top-Down

leadership will be phenomenal in 10 to 15 years to come as DTE is repeated every election regional or national, owing to the learning effect of the voters, and decreased frustrations and misunderstandings thanks to the Small Meetings.

The benefits of DTE are summarized as follows.

- 1) The voters will have good understandings on issues and policies in a big picture through Small Meetings.
- 2) The voters can provide their own ideas, and raise issues and complaints to the elected face-to-face.
- 3) DTE requires voters to use time, limited expenses and most importantly wisdom for discussion, but frustrations will be much less than the conventional election system. This effect reduces seeds of terrorism.
- 4) Candidates need no money to use in DTE, and the election process will have good transparency, because candidates need neither self-promotion, nor preparatory movement for the election.
- 5) Ballot counting is no longer necessary, because candidates are elected at the Small Meetings only.
- 6) Restaurants and conference rooms will be occupied for Small Meetings, with positive impacts to the regional economies.
- 7) Bottom-up effect from the citizens will increase economic impacts to the implemented policies.
- 8) Public servants would improve their services due to direct contacts with the citizens through discussion at Small Meetings.
- 9) Wisdom will be transferred from the experienced elderly to the inexperienced youths, and exchanged among voters with different backgrounds and business sectors.
- 10) Local communities will be formed through Small Meetings.
- 11) The number of candidates will increase drastically because of reasonable process in DTE to reduce bias out of rumors through face-to-face discussion, which would reduce the risk in quality of leadership, whoever the finally elected one would be. (High competition and good steps for election will ensure more qualified voters to be candidates.)
- 12) Psychological logics in election will be totally opposite. The voters will not elect those who want to be politicians, but potential candidates the voters want to be politicians/leaders.
- 13) High possibilities of electing those with excellent hands-on business and technical skills, rather than those good at self-promotion.
- 14) Human networks to be established through Small Meetings and practical Advisers would realize the overall optimization of politics and public administration.
- 15) Periodical evaluation by the Advisers group, every half a year, on the performance of the elected will maintain appropriate tension in the mindsets of the politicians.
- 16) The Advisers with hands-on experiences identified and networked by Small Meetings will

support policy-makings.

Those elected will include tough-minded capable human resources with hands-on experiences in business and technological fields. The elected ones include those who volunteer to keep office for up to a few terms to improve politics from their hands-on experience and perspectives.

For instance, regarding the operation of nuclear power plants, hundreds of politicians had been engaged in the preparation, implementation and continuing subsidies to the regions in Japan before 3.11 Fukushima Accident in 2011. However, having looked at the causes for the accident, none of them seems to have hands-on experience in the fields of risk management, and engineering, since the accidents in Fukushima could have been perfectly avoided, if some of the politicians have the knowledge of junior high school science and math, combined with hands-on experience in power generation and risk management.

If more politicians elected are those with practical hands-on experience, some in global business and small enterprise management, and the others in engineering, more problems will be easily solved with limited budget. If members of the House of Councilors (or one of two Houses) can be elected by DTE, synergy will emerge in cooperation with the House of Representatives in Japan.

If you are once elected by first tier of the Small Meeting by DTE, you are regarded as one in the selected 10%, and those elected twice means 1% of the total. Those elected three times, you are one of 1000, which is 0.1% through discussions of the interested voters participating in DTE.

In Japan, the total competition to be politicians was only 1.2 that is 10 politicians out of 12 candidates in year 2010 which indicates a serious systematic problem in electing social leaders who must be, otherwise, proud of themselves. Reality is very few voters believe politicians are proud professions due to the systematic problem. Many of the current politicians are successors of family politicians, or those good at self-promotions with limited hands-on experiences, who cannot effectively deal with diplomacy and emergencies requiring engineering knowledge and experience, e.g. nuclear power accident.

It is considered that there will be a stark contrast in human quality between those elected by the conventional elections 10 out of 12 candidates, and those elected by DTE, one out of more than 1000 voters through tough deliberative discussions.

5. Epilogue

DTE is neither a revolution nor an innovation in our human history. It is just an accelerated process of ordinary steps to develop and elect future directors and managers from younger staff in excellent

large scale companies.

If DTE is implemented, elected politicians will be those with sincere habit of listening to individuals including those socially disadvantaged, thereby reducing the underlying seeds of terrorism in the world.

It is often misunderstood that wars kill people. The reality is political leaders we elect send young ones to wars. Once a war gets started, the approval rating for the leader will most likely increase. Contrary to some belief, there is no conspiracy with a clear intention, but human lust for more and more drives decision-makings of the leaders, namely politicians to gain support from the influential groups that get financial benefits from wars by sales of arms and mercenary.

It should be stressed that DTE is not yet a perfect quick answer to terrorism. But our efforts to implement DTE at any place, e.g. school, university, can be a great leap to review the current defective election system without any opportunities for discussion in the system proper.

I encourage all the students, scholars, business practitioners, consultants and experts to come up with their own DTE manual by their experiments in their own institutes or countries because mutual understandings by Small Meetings is clearly one of the ultimate answers to any conflicts in this world. Many of us can try their own DTE at their own places and implement Kaizen so that all readers in the world will learn how to implement better DTE.

I believe we should implement Kaizen to the congenital deformity in the current election systems, with Kaizen and Kenzen spirits by holding Small Meetings.

Justification of DTE was discussed in a paper by Joji WATANABE "Japan's political risk can be reduced by Deliberative Democratic Tournament Elections." As a Research Paper in Risk Management Association, Japan (Annual Convention March, 2014)