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Abstract

Kenneth J. Arrow lucidly explained the distinguishing functional feature of democracy in his famous argument concerning the ‘paradox of voting’. It suggests an inevitable social transition from democracy or the democratic framework of society to ochlocracy or an ochlocratic social system. As the so-called ‘social entropy’ gradually increases, human society will fall into disorder and be propelled toward the final goal of complete ochlocracy. Such a historical tendency can be universally predicted, based on viewpoints of systems theory and information science.
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I

As is widely known, K. J. Arrow, an American economist, regarded human society as a set of atomic individuals who only affect each other, and disclosed the formal structure of democracy and democratic organization.¹ I am particularly interested in his arguments concerning the paradox of majority rule that may bring about an efficient perspective on the function and structure of democracy. However, I will not discuss here any topics that have a bearing on Arrow’s ‘social welfare function’ and related themes of welfare economics. Our main subject for inquiry involves connecting the inherent logic of the paradox with a radically recognized concept of democracy.

Such an interpretation of Arrow’s arguments is so biased that it might earn frowns of disapproval from economic theoreticians. However, it is implicitly expected that they will be broadminded about the possibility of this interpretation within the context of social sciences. We are fully convinced that economic science without epistemological creation and reconstruction must fall into decay, since the subject and methodology of economics will become insignificant unless the majority of economic theoreticians can objectify their own ‘real world’ (logistic model) that can be supposed in their theoretical models and consequently assume anything like a metaeconomic standpoint.

II

To begin with, we will try to clarify the formal significance of Arrow’s arguments concerning democracy. The behavior of an individual who tries to optimize his own quantifiable personal — economic, social, political or other — interests may be called rational. Based on the assumption of such rational behavior of individuals, Arrow gave the following illustrations in order to explain the logical structure of the ‘paradox of voting’:

‘Let A, B, and C be the three alternatives, and 1, 2, and 3 the three individuals. Suppose individual 1 prefers A to B and B to C (and therefore A to C), individual 2 prefers B to C and C to A (and therefore B to A), and individual 3 prefers C to A and A to B (and therefore C to B). Then a majority prefers A to B, and a majority prefers B to C. We may therefore say that the community prefers A to B and B to C. If the community is to be regarded as behaving rationally, we are forced to say that A is preferred to C. But in fact a majority of the community prefer C to A."

This argument seems to be an unrealistic logical puzzle, derived from any finite set with pre-order relation. Moreover, such a situation may not actually occur in the real world. However, there are sufficient reasons for believing that the actual society is approaching what is presumed in the Arrow’s ‘paradox’. This recognition of the present society may form the starting point of our argument. As a matter of fact, we can observe a striking increase in a particular type of individuals, who act exclusively on behalf of their own interests with mechanical rationality, but are poorly developed in respect of social awareness and communication, and indifferent to the feelings of others. They may be called isolated men (Einzelnenschen) and a community where they form the vast majority of the population can be named a discrete society.

On the other hand, Arrow added wholly arbitrary and unrealistic conditions when he examined the problem of ‘social choice’ under democracy. They are namely ‘the condition of citizen’s sovereignty’ and that of ‘non-dictatorship’. These two conditions may be assumed to be some sort of initial conditions for specifying a formal order set, and cannot be directly related to a certain social recognition of the real world. They can even be negated by majority rule itself, since the priority of a majority decision may deny freedom of individual choice and, as we will discuss later, it can be consistent with a dictatorship based on the assumption of an independent or one-way-only nature of successive majority votes. Rather, it is more natural and realistic that we only assume dominance of the majority rule as a minimum requirement for democracy.

However, it seems the word democracy seems inappropriate for such a society that satisfies only this minimum condition. Therefore hereafter we will use the word ochlocracy in place of democracy. This may be defined as the lowest grade of democracy that emerges from a marginal situation where, by the analogy of mechanics, the principle of least social action holds whereupon the human energy, which controls social behavior and intelligence, is

---

2 Ibid., p. 3.
3 This word was coined by Ernst Troeltsch. cf. Gesammelte Schriften, Dritter Band, Tübingen, 1922, S. 33.
4 See, Arrow, op.cit, pp. 28-31.
economized as far as possible. From a quite different angle, ochlocracy can be considered a political system that is not based on rational arguments or discussions conducted via the understanding and reasoning process of its members, but exclusively on the application of majority rule for all decision making. Consequently any discrete society is to be oriented toward ochlocracy via the mechanical application of this principle.

What types of reasoning can be made in that case? Now we must try to determine the nature of knowledge in such a society with the system in mind, and then draw a logical conclusion of democratic decision making by introducing several new concepts.

III

As stated above, a formalized and irrelevant democracy or ochlocracy supported by a mass of isolated-men may be regarded as fair game for obtaining a majority. Naturally any social ideal preached by a minority will be neglected there. In a discrete society, which consists of apathetic and isolated men, the fundamental framework for human intelligence is destined to collapse, chronically afflicted by an ‘ignorance of ignorance’. Our aim is to elucidate a formal function of ochlocracy that may increasingly aggravate the situation.

Firstly, we will examine some structural characteristics of the mental situation of ‘ignorance of ignorance’. For that purpose we treat each function of perception, interpretation and ignorance from a system-operator perspective.

(1) Perceptive operator

As T. Kuhn suggested, the perception or action of the perceptive operator may implement the unconscious operation of the human mind. In other words, the perceptive operator can be defined as what is ‘embedded in the stimulus-to-sensation route’. It may produce several different results, according to the difference of personal pillars of its function. For example, the perceptive image that a physicist can obtain from the observation of a cloud chamber will differ completely from what an amateur can perceive by looking at the same object, which is attributable to the difference in the interpretative ability of both observers. Hence we must examine another sort of operator, namely, interpretation-operator or interpretation.

(2) Interpretation-operator or interpretation

Kuhn pointed out that perception is succeeded by interpretation with a brief time-interval. This orderly sequence of time is very important for precisely defining that concept.

We will begin by posing a general problem. When we decide whether something is true or false, good or bad, beautiful or ugly, we assume there exists a certain collection of events, and make a ‘projection’ of the collection upon a two-valued set (for example, \{t, f\} that is consisted of truth and falsehood). The ‘projection’ means morphism in a mathematical meaning, namely, correspondence between elements of a set or different sets. It also may be called assignment, which is a term employed in mathematical logic. We always carry out assignments based on statements such as ‘it is true’ or ‘it is false’. However, when we discuss logically, we must consider that they are propositions in a strict sense, established according to the rules that can be formulated in logic. An especially important set of propositions is that which incurs a contradiction. This represents a situation whereby a given proposition \(P\) and its negation \(\neg P\)

---

Most men of rationality cannot suit themselves to any contradictory situation without psychological resistance. However, such contradictory statements like ‘myth is real’ or ‘the same is different’ are sometimes accepted in human society. What kind of mindset can we adopt on this occasion? In most cases, we can always activate a subjective and defensive chain of reasoning that may be called interpretation.

We can define interpretation as a newly performed assignment through the extension of a given domain that is presumed beforehand. The ‘extension’ means inclusion to the effect that a concrete matter ‘includes’ an abstract one, and therefore it may be replaced by an embodiment or historicization (specification of a certain space-time coordinate). Interpretation must be accompanied by such historicization, since any logical procedures for eliminating contradiction necessitate an extension or embodiment of the given domain or ‘model’, which may admit contradictory statements. The so-called law of participation, formulated by Lévy-Bruhl, may be considered an example of interpretation through historicization. Undoubtedly, interpretation cannot be identified with a mathematical extension itself, because the former includes a changing pattern of assignment that operates alongside the latter. Thus the operation of interpretation has to be reformulated by a system concept. In other words, interpretation means the output control through the extension of input (domain) and at the same time, the modification of a given operator. Consequently it is possible that interpretation may bring about the transformation of the system itself.

(3) Structure of ‘ignorance of ignorance’

Now we can treat the main object of our inquiry, namely, the structure of ‘ignorance of ignorance’. Strictly speaking, a person unable to carry out an efficient perceptive operation on a certain sphere of knowledge may be called an amateur and his lack of such an operation is usually termed ignorance. However, there is a limited type of ignorance that is more harmful and detrimental to human intellectual activity, which can be said to be the ‘ignorance of ignorance’. We will attempt below an analysis of its fundamental and formal structure.

Ignorance suggests that certain knowledge has not remained objectified in human mental activity. To use the expression of Ladrière, a Belgian philosopher, ignorance is defined as the state whereby projection (subjective morphism) does not operate on specific knowledge, or in other words, no thématisation (objectification of a set of knowledge $\kappa$) occurs in the domain of $\kappa$. Thus we can denote it $\neg \kappa$.

Firstly, we will examine the formal mechanism of ‘ignorance of ignorance’. This is a continuous process of the induction of $\kappa$ by applying a perceptive operator $\pi$ to a certain state of ignorance. Since $\pi$ means the addition of the $\neg$ sign, we have

$$\pi(\neg \kappa) = \neg \neg \kappa.$$ 

On the other hand, we can presume a unique operator denoted by $\pi^{-1}$, which returns the right side of the above equality to $\neg \kappa$ when operated on the left side of the same and which may be termed an ignorant operator. Clearly it means the negation of a perceptive operator. If we are to eliminate its operation, we must add one further perceptive operator $\pi^2 = \pi(\pi)$. However, it should be noted that the operation of the first $\pi$ on the right side differs from that

---

of the second and conducts the same meta-operation as a ‘class’ in axiomatic set theory. We must provide ourselves with a specified operator, which works at the meta-level of perception, in order to prevent the appearance of a situation of ‘ignorance of ignorance’.

These considerations can be easily applied to the arguments developed by N. Luhmann, under the concept of ‘observation of observations’⁹. In both cases of projection and thematisation, the first observation (the second π) belongs to an intelligent hierarchy (a degree of perception) which differs from that of the next one (the first π). It is not clear how far Luhmann was methodologically conscious of this point, since his discussions proceeded so descriptively, without any logical procedures of formalization, that we could not reach a clear-cut understanding of his unique opinion. At any rate it is certain that similar reasoning can be applied to several arguments in favor of the possibility of meta-scientific investigation. Indeed, we can consider metamathematics as the mathematics of mathematics.

In metamathematics, as in mathematics proper, a prior concept can often be determined by one that is logically provided later, even if there is a logical order-relation between concepts. For instance, mapping or morphism with an identity or unit element may be regarded as an algebraic structure of monoid, or the method of forcing invented by Paul Cohen¹⁰ has the same logical structure as that of the extension of a field. However, the chief methodological foundation of metamathematics cannot be effectively afforded by ordinary mathematical procedures or mindset, but by logistics or mathematical logic. Consequently, metamathematicians have to move up the hierarchy of the logical concept and explore a more abstract and infinite region.

This point also holds in metaeconomics and certainly, part of the ‘economics of economics’ may be constructed in purely economic terms. For example, all economic research activities will belong to a sort of service industry, where every economist becomes a producer of economic knowledge and his product is ‘transacted’ as a ‘commodity’ that circulates in a ‘market’ named the academic world. However, beyond a certain limit of conceptualization, within economic science proper, metaeconomic analysis cannot be further developed. It will require some adjacent disciplines, such as sociology or social psychology, and may, in several cases, rely upon the methodology of philosophy, including logic and the structural cognition of mathematics and metamathematics. In such a sense, the logical hierarchy of metaeconomics differs considerably from that of conventional economic theory.

Now, if we put the discussion of these meta-observations aside for a moment, we will proceed to the next subject, namely, the structural analysis of the ‘ignorance of ignorance’. We shall define it as a mental situation where no sensitive operator is working on the state of ignorance (¬κ). Two distinct cases may be highlighted. The first is a situation where no ‘projection’ or subjective morphism can operate on cognitive objects. The second involves all workings of a sensitive operator being cancelled out by an ignorant operator.

Since the first case extends over a wide range of intelligent activities, we restrict our arguments to circumstances where there is rambling and arbitrary action of the sensitive operator. This is deeply connected with the second case, especially in the social context of scientific research, of which the so-called ‘historical science’ may be the most typical example.

A ‘historical scientist’ or historian often deludes himself that he is manufacturing

⁹ Quoted from Luhmann, op.cit, S. 119.
something akin to projection, although in fact, he is likely to become only a dilettante who has unconsciously lost any opportunity for the theoretical generalization of his findings. His mentality and attitude to science may be termed historism (Historismus\(^{11}\)). Under historism, it is true that a certain accumulation of knowledge may become vast, but in most cases, the evaluation of its theoretical significance is neglected or underestimated, and only the conventional value of the accumulating activity itself is assessed to an unreasonable extent. Any positive opinions about historism may come down to a sort of relativism that results in the negation of the cognizance of ignorance. Genuine scientific recognition is often eliminated indefensibly under historism, since the concretization and fractionalization of research objects itself is believed to be a scientific activity. Consequently various pseudo-sciences cluster around historical studies or ‘hobbies’, and simultaneously, the situation of ‘ignorance of ignorance’ will develop everywhere.

The second case may be more complex, because it brings into question an organizational problem of scientists’ groups that is an essential part of the paradigm. It also becomes closely entwined with self-preserving organizational movements or the ‘corporationalizing’ trend. In any case, ‘ignorance of ignorance’ will occur in a given society where most people are unable to freely operate their morphism and projection, but simply take their own self-interests into consideration. Such a society may be termed a discrete society that comprises isolated men.

IV

What sorts of social effects does the ‘ignorance of ignorance’ bring about? This is our next problem. For that purpose we must first examine how the cognizance of ignorance can be realized. Several conditions have to be fulfilled for the working of a sensitive or interpretative operator that is motivated by the cognizance of ignorance and two conditions in particular may be indispensable. The first is that the domain of an information set, which is acceptable as input, can be extended as far as possible, while the second is that the above operator works with sympathy and empathy to various messages, which are ordinarily dispatched within a given society. However, the extent of information as input may constantly diminish under the social context of ‘ignorance of ignorance’, since a majority of the population shall consist of isolated men who can only scrawl one-way messages for their own sake.

With this in mind, what kinds of society can be made up by such a type of human being? Every isolated man defends a behavior-standard called ‘equality’, but he lacks all mentality of philanthropist ideas or altruism. For him equality means that one has the same chance of rationally advancing one’s own interests as one’s peers. Consequently various groups of isolated men may be organized when there is an intersection of information sets of members dispatching messages of their own profits, or, in other words, when a coalition among them can be successfully formed. If an isolated man can only accept and dispatch limited messages, which are always needed for his own rights, he is to occupy a private position of exclusive freedom. The increase in such a type of freedom will make the density of his information set extremely low, especially under the circumstances of ‘ignorance of ignorance’. For this reason,

\(^{11}\) As to the meaning of Historismus, see Troeltsch, ‘Der Historismus und seine Probleme’, in the above Gesammelte Schriften.
a group of isolated men and their organization are destined to make up a discrete society that is composed of disjoint sets of information.

How can a decision making of that society and its organizations be carried out? The interests of each of the members must be aggregated according to the above ‘equality’ — indifference — principle. Therefore all sets of personal interests must be countable and comparable with one another. For instance, the freedom of the majority of isolated men will be greater than that of the other minorities. Finally they are to establish the fundamental principle of ochlocracy, i.e. collective decision making based on the majority rule. In other words, every ochlocracy system works according to the functional orientation of majority operator. Next we will formalize its workings.

Let us suppose that a set of members (isolated men) of a given social system shall be collectively represented by a vector $\alpha$. Then we may have a ‘majority vector’ $\lambda \alpha$ ($\lambda$ is a certain real number) with the action of the majority operator $\mu$ upon $\alpha$, that is,

$$\mu \alpha = \lambda \alpha.$$  

Now we will assume that each time a vote is given, the majority gains from the decision. It means that the operator $\mu$ is associative and composable repeatedly. If we operate $\mu$ upon $\alpha$ $n$ times, we have

$$\mu^n \alpha = \lambda^n \alpha \ (n: \text{natural number}),$$

where $\mu^n$ means $n$ times of left side composition ($\cdot$): $\mu \cdot \mu \cdot \cdots \cdot \mu$.

Clearly the right side of this equality represents the majority. As the frequency of the majority decision increases, the absolute value of $\lambda^n$ is diminishing and there will be a rise in its rate of decrease when $\lambda$ comes up around 1/2.

Mathematically $\lambda$ may be termed an eigenvalue. If the eigenvector $\alpha$ is $m$-components vector $(a_1, a_2, \ldots a_m)$, then

$$\lambda \alpha = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{(m/2)+1}, \ldots),$$

since $\mu$ performs the function of a sort of annihilation operator upon $\alpha$. If we assume the following order relation of non-negative vectors:

$$\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \ldots \geq \alpha_i \geq \ldots \geq \alpha_n \ (\lambda^i \alpha = \alpha_i),$$

then we have

$$\mu^n \alpha = \lambda^n \alpha = \alpha_n.$$  

Finally $\alpha_n$ will converge at $(a_1, a_2, 0, 0, \ldots)$ which indicates a rival relation. When either $a_1$ or $a_2$ becomes zero, namely, when the rival is defeated or killed, a dictatorship is to be established.

In fact, each decision by the majority rule may be made mutually independent, and a temporal sequence of such decision making under a specified social system shall result in the self-preservation of the system or the formation of a dictatorship respectively. This process means the previously mentioned ‘corporationalizing’, or, to use a more metaphysical expression, the ‘permanent deterioration’ (M. Merleau-Ponty\textsuperscript{12}).

These considerations may not only apply to the understanding of any formal social system that is exclusively based on majority rule, but also the interpretation of more concrete social activities, such as economic monopolization or a ‘democratic’ policy of distribution. Here we will make a passing reference to the latter case.

A system of income distribution under capitalism may be considered ‘stable’ when it is explicitly or tacitly supported by the majority of a given society. On this occasion the order relation of a continuous income hierarchy, represented by the so-called Lorenz curve, bears a decisive functional meaning, since its continuity may invalidate a conventional confrontational binary relation such as ‘bourgeoisie versus proletariat’ or ‘capitalist versus laborer’. If almost any claim of the lower bracket can be ignored by ochlocratic decision making, or in other words, the upper half income earners gain a majority, the existing system of income distribution will become ‘stable’. Moreover, if there is a situation whereby most of the wage earners who belong to the lower income group have a middle-class consciousness and may indeed have a slim chance of moving up the income hierarchy, even the policy of preferential treatment to large income earners may be ‘stable’. With this in mind, the economic and social domination of the ‘capitalist class’, which is supposed by some doctrinaire Marxists, can become increasing ‘stable’ in almost every capitalist nation against their optimistic expectations.

On the other hand, N. Lenin, the most reckless Marxian strategist, utilized the above binary relation to reverse the existing income hierarchy. He plotted and accomplished a sort of ‘ochlocratic revolution’, by rallying an overwhelming majority of Russian peasants. Indeed he converted the schema: ‘bourgeoisie versus proletariat’, which bore little relation to what actually occurred in Russian society, into an effective apparatus of propaganda for an agrarian revolution. Consequently the Bolshevik Revolution contributed to constructing a ‘stable’ political system of ochlocracy that was supported by the mass of the ‘agrarian proletariat’. As was naturally anticipated, the system was transformed into a pseudo-socialistic dictatorship of Stalin, who had held the unrivaled leadership of the Communist party. Under the pretext of the Marxist and Leninist golden rule, he used mind control and offensive violence on a mass of ‘people’ who were supposed to perform the functions of ochlocratic decision making. Note-worthy from our present perspective is the fact that the Russian ‘people’ under the Stalinist regime might bear a certain striking similarity to Japanese ‘subjects’ in the ‘Great Empire of Japan’ in that both these nations had an extremely dependent group mentality with no individual social volition and personal freedom.

However, we will put an end to these considerations of concrete and historical cases, since they may miss the original target of our present analysis. We must proceed to the next subject, that is, to make clear the nature of the field where majority operator works. It is a well-known fact that the original meaning of democracy can be defined as government by the people, for the people, of the people, and therefore the majority rule is not immediately included in it. Here we will reexamine the concept of democracy from the aspect of decision making, concerning the personal domination and self-preservation of an isolated man, and specify the minimum condition for the working of the majority operator.

Now let us suppose that an isolated man is a self-reproductive or autopoiesis system.\(^\text{13}\) If so, the making of a certain decision by several persons will formally denote the composition of

---

\(^\text{13}\) As to the theoretical contents of these concepts, see, Luhmann, *Soziale System: Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie*, Frankfurt am Main, 1984.
such a system, which may be classified under three elementary headings:

1. Decision making of the Robinson Crusoe type
   This is a case where an isolated man, such as Crusoe, makes a living without social groups or community. He must obey his own orders and make decisions in the form of self-domination. Certainly, self-domination is one of the most fundamental elements of democracy, but remains no more than a necessary condition for the latter. In order that democracy be sufficiently definable, it must be based on a social relationship.

2. Two-person decision making
   In this case a continuous recurrence of personal decision making may be possible, even if there is a one-way acceptance of the partner’s request. This is typically applied to the case of a married couple. In the couple, mutual respect and tolerance is the normal state, and only exceptionally can any elements of domination be found.

3. Three-person decision making
   This case may admit, for the first time, the domination of another person. It becomes acceptable insofar as it is not incompatible with each member’s self-determination. The majority rule is also feasible, since a two-thirds majority is always possible. Indeed this case may be regarded as the proto-type of the majority decision making, and it furnishes a field for the majority operator.

V

The final crux of our arguments is the following point: How many choices of behavior are there left to individuals or a group of persons who belong to an unassimilated minority under an ochlocratic system? It seems to me that three distinct types can be categorized:

1. Reproduction of a minority on a regressive scale
   This type is represented by a case where ochlocracy emerges within a minority group, one which is often dissolved by a chain of strict and terrorist enforcement of dogmatic disciples, as was symbolically described in the Devils, the famous Dostoyevsky novel.

2. Radically hostile behavior against the majority
   Some members of a minority, who have realized that an ochlocracy is inevitable, often launch a terrorist attack against the majority, since they must live honorably for their own ideals that can be represented only by a handful of like-minded people. The most typical and tragic example of such behavior may be a suicide bombing, which is equivalent to religious self-immolation and at the same time, anti-majority terrorism that becomes its own end.

3. Suicide as such
   Suicide is the ultimate means of resistance to a great and increasing majority. It is sometimes an inevitable and desperate choice that is left to members of a minority who cannot expect to improve their social positions.

   It should be noted that there are a few social tendencies common to these three types, of which alienation is the most global phenomenon. This denotes a state of individual isolation from various social systems. Most isolated men cannot be conscious of alienation, since they are unable to objectify their social beings. In order that it could be widely recognized as an important social issue, the level of individual self-consciousness must be substantially en-
hanced. As Nisbet himself discussed in detail,\(^4\) concrete forms of alienation can be further divided into three elementary types: economic, political and social. However, no further comments on this topic are required for our present purpose.

Another social tendency may be rather paradoxical. As a matter of fact, people who have the most enhanced and sophisticated social awareness tend to be the biggest defenders of the social minority. They are sometimes noble-minded individuals with the spirit of independence, radical individuals who severely criticize the existing social order, or champions of humanitarian causes, who will fight for social justice and stand by the weak. In short, they are persons of real and genuine humanity. However, as was suggested, ochlocracy may logically and radically demand the exclusion of humanity from every human society and, at the same time, the mechanization of the real world, since it is the most efficient and simple-minded means for forming a majority within a deteriorated mass society.

If such reasoning is true, is there any potential for a mere shell of democracy to revert to its original form? Masao Maruyama, a most influential Japanese social scientist, had high hopes for ‘the inner combination of a radically intellectual aristocracy and radical democracy’\(^15\). However, the gloomy view that democracy will be finally transformed into irredeemable ochlocracy seems to be more realistic, because even if democracy is pursued radically, the majority of individuals in a given society shall only permit its useful function (the majority rule) for their own superiority and consequently forget its original ideal. In other words, democracy will gradually lose its true meaning and become a mere formal voting procedure.

This is an expected irreversible process of transition from democracy to ochlocracy. An atmosphere of ‘radically intellectual aristocracy’ may be the only solitary trace of this process. As a striking example, we can highlight the intellectualism of J. M. Keynes that has been called ‘the presuppositions of Harvey Road’\(^16\). However, it had to lose its realistic meaning according to the increase in ‘democratic’ state intervention. Similarly and generally, the tradition of ‘intellectual aristocracy’ will fade away from the mainstream of human history.

Nevertheless there is a different way to survive for an intellectual minority. As information system diffuses widely and society advances toward the situation where everyone may share any information on a network, most of isolated minorities can dispatch their messages from their own localities. We will discover the real meaning of such a messenger activity of a minority people only when we can confirm the existence of a chance that each liberal individual might live on by creating and destructing various open personal relations through information system. Clearly nobody knows whether or not one can achieve better communications between individuals or groups. However, there is nothing a minority people can do except have high hopes for this possibility of social contact.

Needless to say, we can never anticipate a brilliant future when we will reach the ideal of democracy, since the majority formed by democratic institutions must bring about the transformation of democracy into ochlocracy. The majority will not favor any movements for the ideals of democracy, but merely make use of its formal function for its own interests. In other words, the possibility of the tyranny of the majority will arise almost everywhere. In a certain partially modernized nation like Japan, a specified type of majority rule has been


\(^{15}\) Quoted from M. Maruyama, *Denken in Japan*, Frankfurt am Main, 1988, S.156.

established. Maruyama called it the ‘system of irresponsibility’\(^\text{17}\). Even if a person or a majority group engages in a menacing and violent act against certain members of a minority under that system, its responsibility is always evaded or left unclear. On the contrary, if the minority people take the same act against the majority, their responsibility can be pinned down so tenaciously as to trigger a ruthless massacre. Under such a generalized system of irresponsibility, there can be no social movements to realize the fundamental democratic ideal, because any effectual social observations and communications at a meta-level can be extremely difficult, if not impossible. Rather ‘ignorance of ignorance’ will thrive under such circumstances and public sentiment may transform into an ochlocratic scramble. Consequently the system will only engender complacency in the majority, where almost all only adapt themselves to an exogenously given social environment and engage in passive action of self-contentment. Even forcefully ordered death may become an object of complacency for the majority. In fact, as is indicated by many historical facts, it has been accepted under the high-sounding name of self-immolation or ‘Gyokusai’ (death in honor).

\(^{17}\) See, Maruyama, *op.cit*, S. 52.