世論調査に実用を生かせ

山田 奏教

財政再建の原発

年金、税金、財政再建に悪影響を及ぼす世論調査は実用を生かせなければなりません。山田奏教は、世論調査の実用を生かすための戦略を提言します。

山田奏教は、世論調査の実用を生かすためには、政府の政策を反映する必要があると述べています。政府は、世論調査の結果を反映して政策を制定することが重要です。山田奏教は、政府が世論調査の結果を反映することで、市民の声を反映する政策を制定することが重要であると考えています。
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Current democratic systems have to solve many difficult scientific and technological problems such as nuclear plant accidents, climate change, and complications in genetic engineering.

With the situation in Fukushima, there is a risk that problems in those fields may remain unknown even in the future.

It is unfair that future generations cannot discuss or vote for those problems now even though they will have to deal with nuclear waste and a warmer earth caused by current generations.

We also see similar issues around us such as in Social Security and taxations that we postponed to pay for in the future.

Current democracy is not good at solving generational problems systematically. How is it possible to suppress the selfishness of the current generations and make decisions taking future generations into consideration?

We can find one possible answer in the “Deliberative Poll (DP)” held at Keio University on May 28 and 29 in Mita, Tokyo.

It is a different from a normal survey. One hundred twenty seven people composed of male, female, and all generations were chosen from randomly selected three thousand people from all over Japan. Some participants were from Iwate, Miyagi, and Fukushima Prefecture therefore turning each classroom into a microcosm of Japan.

The main theme was “Pension System, A Generational Choice.” The participants discussed three themes including “Social Insurance Method or All Tax Method” in small groups. At the plenary session, participants asked scholars and specialists a variety of questions related to the theme.

It was more than 10 hours “deliberation” in total. The purpose was not to make a consensus as a whole but to make each participant understand the issues over the two days.

One of the interesting points is that they had to answer the same surveys before and after the discussions therefore we can understand clearly whether or not the participants changed their thoughts.

For example, the idea that “consumption tax should be increased and used for Social Security” was more supported after the deliberation than it was before.
Another example is that more participants supported the idea that “we should take future generation into account more than current generation” after the deliberation.

Professor James Fishkin of Stanford University, a founder of DP who came to Japan for this event said “What I can say from past experiences in other countries is that people are actually smart. If people were provided this opportunity, people would come up with rational ideas.”

Indeed, some of the past results were used in actual policy decision processes in other countries.

According to Professor Yasunori Sone of Keio University, a chief of Keio DP, it is a unique case in DP that focuses on generational problem. “We can change Japanese democracy if we can use DP to solve the problem of fairness among generations.”

Considering that we have to watch the malfunction of the Diet and partisan politics, the DP has a great meaning in terms of challenging to create a new democratic method.

How about a combination of a referendum and a DP? For example, what kind of results we would see if many people vote after they have the opportunity to “learn,” “think,” and “talk”?

There are many places we can add, reform, and develop the current democratic system.