

JOURNAL OF MODERN SCIENCE

SPECIAL ISSUE

3 / 57 / 2024

www.jomswsge.com



DOI: doi.org/10.13166/jms/189568

DAWID JAKIMIEC

WSEI University in Lublin, Poland

ORCID iD: orcid.org/0000-0002-1310-3944

**THE ORIGIN OF THE EMERGENCE
OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND THE
EVOLUTION OF THE PARTY SYSTEM
AND LEGAL REGULATIONS REGARDING
THE FINANCING OF POLITICAL
ACTIVITIES IN JAPAN**

**GENEZA POWSTANIA PARTII
POLITYCZNYCH I EWOLUCJA SYSTEMU
PARTYJNEGO A REGULACJE PRAWNE
W ZAKRESIE FINANSOWANIA DZIAŁAŃ
POLITYCZNYCH W JAPONII**

ABSTRACT

The article presents the stages of creation and development of the party system and political parties in Japan, as well as various definitions of the party system, and assesses the directions of evolution of the Japanese political system. In addition, the genesis and activities of the Liberal Democratic Party were outlined, as well as the topic of transparency and legal regulations in the area of financing political activities in Japan. In order to present the evolution of Japan's political system, one must deal not only with legal regulations regarding the party, electoral and political system, but also with issues such as political culture, history and various conditions, i.e. everything that influenced the evolution of a given political system. countries. Party systems remain closely related to the political systems within which they operate, which results in the observable difficulty with which their comparative analyzes or broader and more general characteristics are created.

STRESZCZENIE

W artykule przedstawiono etapy powstania i kształtowania się systemu partyjnego i partii politycznych w Japonii a także różne ujęcia definicyjne systemu partyjnego oraz dokonano oceny kierunków ewolucji japońskiego systemu politycznego. Ponadto zarysowana została geneza powstania i działalność Partii Liberalno-Demokratycznej, a także podjęto tematykę dotyczącą transparentności i regulacji prawnych w obszarze finansowania działań politycznych w Japonii. Celem zaprezentowania ewolucji systemu politycznego Japonii, trzeba się zmierzyć nie tylko z regulacjami prawnymi dotyczącymi systemu partyjnego, wyborczego i politycznego, ale również z zagadnieniami takimi, jak: kultura polityczna, historia oraz różnorodnymi uwarunkowaniami, czyli wszystkim tym, co wpłynęło na ewolucję systemu politycznego danego państwa. Systemy partyjne pozostają w ścisłym związku z systemami politycznymi, w ramach których funkcjonują, czego rezultatem jest obserwowalna trudność, z jaką tworzone są ich analizy porównawcze czy szersze i ogólniejsze charakterystyki.

KEYWORDS: *party system, political party, Liberal Democratic Party, transparency, legal regulations, political culture*

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: system partyjny, partia polityczna, Partia Liberalno-Demokratyczna, transparentność, regulacje prawne, kultura polityczna

STAGES OF FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARTY SYSTEM IN JAPAN

Research on political parties is related to research on the party systems in which these parties operate. Party systems began to be established in the second half of the 19th century, at the same moment when modern political groups were created. The emergence of these systems was a consequence of the extension of the right to vote to those social groups that previously did not have it. Canadian political scientist Robert McKenzie stated that the modern party system is a direct product of the expansion of the electorate (McKenzie, 1955). There are many definitions of the party system in the literature on the subject. One definition defines the party system as a group of political parties operating according to legally defined rules within a given society (Sokół, Żmigrodzki, 2008). It is worth noting that the definitional approaches of M. Duverger, J. Blondel and G. Sartori have become classic. French researcher Maurice Duverger in his work *Les Partis Politiques* stated that the party system is the forms and ways of coexistence of political parties in a given country (Duverger, 1965).

Typologies of party systems make it possible to go beyond the framework of specific cases of party systems in given countries. One of the most common approaches takes the number of parties in the system as the basic criterion of typology (Sobolewska-Myślik, 2004). One of the most recognized contemporary political theorists, Giovanni Sartori, defined the party system as a system of interactions resulting from competition between parties (Sartori, 1976). Party systems remain closely related to the political systems within which they operate, which results in the observable difficulty with which their comparative analyzes or broader and more general characteristics are created. Giovanni Sartori assumed that in order to better recognize the mechanism of the system, the quantity criterion should be supplemented with other elements that could more precisely define individual types of systems. He advocates a quantitative-qualitative approach because, as he claims, the number of parties matters and indicates the degree of concentration of power. In the model presented in 1976, Sartori used the number of parties and the ideological and ideological distance between them as criteria, also taking into account the intensity of inter-party conflicts and the importance

of individual groupings. He distinguished: a two-party system, moderate pluralism, polarized pluralism and a predominant party system (Sartori 1976). In a two-party system, the greatest role is played by two bipolar parties facing each other, which compete for the absolute majority of parliamentary seats. The winning party in a given election gains a sufficient parliamentary majority and governs independently. Moderate pluralism is characterized by the presence of at least three relevant parties, each of which has a chance of electoral victory and forming a government. This type may take various forms, mainly depending on whether there is an independent government without a coalition partner or whether coalitions are formed. The system of polarized pluralism is created by more than three parties, usually five or six groupings. Its characteristic feature is the fact that on the left-right axis there is a clearly outlined center, occupied by one or more parties. In this system, anti-system opposition is extremely common, negating the pillars on which a given political system is based. Groups in polarized pluralism are strongly ideological, which means that the competition between them focuses on fundamental values and worldview issues more often than on pragmatic issues. The pre-dominant party model, unlike the others, is not associated with a specific number of parties and can exist in the conditions of the functioning of both two and many parties. A characteristic feature of this system is that the dominant party gains the majority needed to form a government. It should be emphasized that, according to G. Sartori, this majority does not have to be absolute. In order for a given system to be considered the system of the pre-dominant party, it is necessary for the same party to win the elections in three consecutive elections. A clear example of the pre-dominant party system, despite its fluctuations in recent years, is the Japanese party system, in which the Liberal Democratic Party, since its establishment in 1955, was deprived of power for short periods only twice (in 1993 and 2009) due to electoral defeats. In the remaining elections, it won, which in most cases allowed it to achieve an absolute majority in parliament and, as a result, rule independently.

The Japanese party system remains, in accordance with the assumptions of G. Sartori's classification, a pre-dominant party system, in which the Liberal Democratic Party holds a dominant position. Analyzing individual periods in the development of the Japanese party system, we can distinguish:

- **Multi-party system (1874-1940)** – the first parties were continuators of earlier coteries whose organization was formalized. From them a conservative trend developed. In the period 1927-32, two right-wing parties alternated at the helm of government. After 1932, political parties lost real influence on state policy, and the government was taken over by the military.
- **One-party system (1940-45)** – in 1940, the parties were banned and their place was taken by the Imperial Rule Assistance Association (Tubielewicz 1984) – a façade party, which was basically a group of supporters supporting the current military doctrine and rule.
- **Two-block system (1945-55)** – due to the collapse of the pre-war dictatorship, the country's party system had to redefine its framework. A typical phenomenon for the party system that was developing from scratch was party fragmentation, i.e. the division of the political scene into many small groupings. Japanese political parties were strongly ideological and a clear two-block division was established into the conservative right and the socialist left. The processes of transformation of political parties took place within the blocs from which two parties emerged: the Liberal Democratic Party (*Jimin-tō*) and the Socialist Party of Japan (*Nihon Shakaitō*). The communists maintained party unity within the Japanese Communist Party (*Kyōsantō*).
- **Pre-dominant party system (1955-93)** – The party system that emerged in post-war Japan is commonly called the *1955 System*. It took its name from the date of establishment of the political party, which has since dominated the country's political scene for almost half a century. This is a pre-dominant party system where, among the multitude of existing political parties, only one is strong enough to form a government. Dominance by one party can be said to occur when this party wins approximately 40% of the votes in several consecutive elections and is separated from other rivals by a difference of approximately 20% (Żmigrodzki, 1999).
- **Dominant party system (1993-...)** – since 1993, the LDP has not won an absolute majority of seats in each subsequent election, and is therefore unable to govern on its own. Coalition cabinets have probably

become a permanent part of Japan's political system. In the elections held in September 2009, for the first time since 1955, another party dethroned the LDP. The Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) won, and its chairman Yukio Hatoyama took over as prime minister.

THE ESTABLISHMENT AND ACTIVITIES OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN JAPAN

Political parties in Japan began to emerge in the wake of the reforms of the Meiji era. Based on the Meiji Constitution (1887), a parliament was created to express the opinions of the people. The establishment of the parliament required the selection of representatives who would become members of this body. In such a case, the best breeding ground for political elites seems to be voluntary, formalized structures representing the interests of specific groups – political parties. The creation of the parliament certainly had a significant impact on the development of the political system, but the first political groups appeared earlier, created on the basis of former aristocratic coteries – clans supporting a specific family, protecting its estates and interests at the imperial court.

The first party was the **Public Party of Patriots** (*Aikoku Kōtō*), formed in January 1874. Right-wing ideals were represented by the Liberal Party (*Jiyūtō*), founded by Taisuke Itagaki in 1881, and the Constitutional Reform Party (*Rikken Kaishintō*), founded by Shigenubu Ōkuma in March 1882. In June 1889, the two parties merged into the Constitutional Party (*Kenseitō*), which later changed its name to the Progressive Party (*Shimpotō*). The process of liberalization of public life encountered certain obstacles. The press law passed in 1875 allowed censorship, and the *law for the protection of peace* of 1887 limited the activities of political parties with general provisions on maintaining public order. The Constitutional Reform Party formed the first cabinet in the country's history, headed by Prime Minister Ōkuma. However, four months after the uprising, it split into two parts. A new group emerged, whose name: the Real Constitutional Party (*Kensei Hontō*) was intended to indicate who best represented the legacy of its predecessor. The remaining activists, led by Itō Hirobumi, established the Association of Friends of Constitutional Government (*Rikken*

Seiyūkai) in September 1900 (Tubielewicz, 1984). The Real Constitutional Party transformed itself into the Constitutional Politics Association (*Kenseikai*) in October 1916. In June 1927, the Constitutional Politics Association, together with a group of politicians from the Association of Friends of Constitutional Government, created the Constitutional Democratic Party (*Rikken Minseitō*).

On the left side of the political scene, the first workers' party was the **Social Democratic Party** (*Shakai Minshutō*), founded in May 1901. In 1926, three socialist parties: the Social Democratic Party (*Shakai Minshūtō*), the Japan Labour-Farmer Party (*Nihon Rōnōtō*) and the Labor-Farmer Party (*Rōdō Nōmintō*) nominated their candidates for the parliamentary elections. In 1932, several small workers' parties formed the Social Mass Party (*Shakai Taishūtō*). In 1937, the Japanese Proletarian Party (*Nihon Musantō*) was founded (Tubielewicz, 1984). In 1922, the Japanese Communist Party (*Nihon Kyōsantō*) began its activities. Due to repression by the state authorities, the party was dissolved in 1924. In 1926, it resumed its activities, but only underground (Berton, 2000).

The multitude of groupings that emerged is typical of the pioneering period of the formation of the political system. The beginnings of the party system in Japan can therefore be described as a multi-party system (1874-1940), which, under the influence of political events, changed quite rapidly into a single-party system (1940-45). When supporters of military rule assassinated the prime minister in 1932, political parties lost their influence on public life. In 1940 they were banned. The place of the previous parties was taken by the Imperial Rule Assistance Association (Tubielewicz, 1984), which was simply an element of the government apparatus, without any possibility of actively shaping the country's policy. The war lost by Japan wiped out the Association from the political scene. The new constitution and the *Bill of Rights* adopted in 1945 contributed to changes in Japan's political life. Thanks to the liberalization of the party system, political parties began to emerge in the fall of 1945 (Pałasz-Rutkowska, Starecka, 2004). Two strong parties were created, which is why the period 1945-55 can be called a two-block system. The conservatives organized themselves into two parties: the Japan Liberal Party (*Nihon Jiyūtō*) was led by Prince Shidehara, and then Hitoshi Ashida, and the leader of the Japan Liberal Party (*Nihon Shimpotō*) was Ichirō Hatoyama.

THE DOMINANCE OF THE LIBERAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE 1955 SYSTEM IN JAPAN

A characteristic feature of the Japanese party system is that for most of the post-war period, especially in the years 1955-1993, when the so-called 1955 System (*gojūgonen taisei*), Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) prevailed.

The Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) was established on November 15, 1955 as a result of the merger of two relevant groups: the Japan Democratic Party and the Liberal Party. As a result of this political merger, for the first time in Japanese history, all the most influential conservative politicians became members of one party. The development of the Liberal Democratic Party can be divided into several periods: in the years 1955-76 the LDP won enough seats in the elections to govern itself, in the years 1976-86 it lost its absolute majority in parliament, in the years 1986-92 the party went from its greatest success to election to the deepest crisis, in 1993-96 it lost power, and in 1996-2007 it formed coalition governments.

To emphasize the importance of the transformation of the political scene in 1955, the term *1955 System* was introduced in Japanese political science, which has become a permanent part of the world literature on the subject. A characteristic feature of the *1955 System* is the decisive domination of the LDP, which continuously obtained an absolute majority in subsequent parliamentary elections for 38 years, allowing it to independently form the cabinet. During this period, only in 1983 the LDP concluded a parliamentary coalition with another grouping – the New Liberal Club, which, due to the small number of seats allocated to it, did not exert any noticeable influence on the government. This period of coalition government did not last long, as already in the 1986 elections the LDP achieved a significant victory, winning 300 seats in the then 511-seat House of Representatives (the lower house of parliament), which was the most decisive electoral success in the party's history to date. In 1993, opposition parties led to elections in which the Liberal Democratic Party was defeated, gaining 223 seats, as a result of which it lost the opportunity to govern (Kubas, 2011). The year 1993 (Żakowski, 2011), in which the LDP was removed from power by the Japan Socialist Party and its smaller coalition partners, is considered the end date of the *1955 System*. The period of

functioning of the Liberal Democratic Party as an opposition group did not last long, because in the next parliamentary elections held on October 20, 1996, it won 239 seats, which allowed it to form an independent government. The 2003 elections showed that the DPJ was gaining more and more popularity among Japanese society and strengthening its position, but the next elections, held on September 11, 2005, brought the party a clear defeat, which resulted in winning only 117 seats. In the same election, the LDP obtained 296 seats, which, together with the 31 parliamentary seats of its coalition partner, the Komeito party, gave these two groups a constitutional majority of 2/3 of the votes in the House of Representatives. A significant change on the Japanese political scene was brought by the early elections held on August 30, 2009. In this election, the LDP suffered a devastating defeat, retaining only 112 seats in the House of Representatives, which was by far the party's worst electoral result since its founding in 1955. LDP lost its status as the largest parliamentary grouping to DPJ, which gained 308 seats in the lower house of the Japanese parliament, which gave it the opportunity to govern independently. For the second time in its history, the Liberal Democratic Party had to come to terms with the role of the opposition party and, for the first time, with the position of not the largest parliamentary party. Based on the scale of the LDP's loss in 2009, some researchers see a real breakthrough and the implementation of a systemic change of a completely new quality, which will result in the establishment of a two-party system with two main actors – LDP and DPJ, cyclically changing the position of the ruling party (Żakowski, 2011). In 2012, the Liberal Democratic Party achieved electoral success again, allowing it to form a cabinet and return to its dominant position in the Japanese party system. Politicians of the Liberal Democratic Party, thanks to their many years of staying in power, created conditions that allowed them to manipulate the electoral system. They share common features with the phenomenon of gerrymandering. Gerrymandering, which involves the instrumental drawing or changing of electoral district boundaries in order to obtain maximum benefits for selected candidates, political parties or interest groups (Chmaj, Skrzydło, 2011).

The shape of electoral districts favors disproportion in voting power, especially between urban and rural voters, which violates the constitutional principle of equal elections. The disproportion in voting power is reflected in

the fact that in some urban districts, there are approximately 400,000 votes per seat, while there are rural districts where the vote of approximately 150,000 voters is enough to win a seat. It is therefore noticeable that rural areas are clearly overrepresented in parliament. Japan's modern electoral system does not take into account demographic changes resulting from migration movements, as a result of which currently approximately 78 percent of Japanese people live in cities, while in the 1940s, when electoral districts were designated, approximately 60 percent lived in rural areas.

In order to talk about the political processes and tendencies of a given country, you need to familiarize yourself with the political system and systems that prevail there. Japan is a constitutional monarchy, which means that sovereign power in the country rests with the monarch, in the case of Japan – the emperor, and this is clearly written in the Constitution. The highest body of government in Japan is the Parliament, which consists of two houses: the House of Representatives, which is the lower house, and the House of Councilors, which is the upper house. They exercise legislative power, while the executive power is exercised by the government (cabinet) headed by the Prime Minister. When trying to accurately determine Japan's party system, several important factors must be taken into account: Japan has a huge number of political parties, but only a few of them can be seen in parliament, and in addition, one party has a clear majority of seats. Therefore, the party system in Japan can be described as extremely multi-party with one dominant party. The party system of a given country is one of the fastest variables in its political and legal system. Its figure is largely determined by the sovereign, i.e. the society casting its votes during general elections. Japan's party system stands out internationally because it has remained unchanged for over 60 years, including the Liberal Democratic Party that has remained in power. The beginning of her rule was remembered as a series of successes called the *Hatoyama boom*, when the then prime minister, from the Democratic Party of Japan, Ichirō Hatoyama, led to Japan's accession to the United Nations and renewed diplomatic relations with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

TRANSPARENCY AND LEGAL REGULATIONS REGARDING THE FINANCING OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES IN JAPAN

According to Gerald L. Curtis, a professor at Columbia University specializing in Japanese politics, *Japan's laws governing the rules of conducting an election campaign, campaign financing, and election announcements are much stricter and introduce more restrictions than in other democratic countries. In Japan, an individual politician cannot buy airtime on television or radio or advertise in newspapers at all.* Each candidate for public office receives free, statutory air time on television or radio, as well as space in a newspaper. The list of available media is also legally defined. All costs are covered by the state. However, these privileges are subject to far-reaching restrictions – regulations include whether a politician must stand or sit, or whether he can use props during his speech. The regulations also cover other issues, such as the use of cars, the permitted number of leaflets sent by post and handed out directly, including the number of their varieties, and the markings of electoral offices and posters. The reason for the creation of such a law was the desire to provide equal opportunities to candidates with different financial resources. One of the problems caused by the 1994 law is the inability to widely use modern technologies and political marketing techniques. Direct campaigning is also subject to restrictions. Neither the candidate nor volunteers can go door-to-door encouraging voters in their own homes. The official campaign for the lower house is limited to a maximum of two weeks, so free airtime is limited to that period, but the campaign actually starts much earlier. The law does not strictly regulate telephone campaigns, which is also eagerly exploited (Christensen, 2015).

The specificity of the elections after the change in electoral law in 1994 is the method taken from nationalists of encouraging people to use their slogans in the form of cars covered with posters and leaflets with loudspeakers placed on the roof. Nationalists, back in the 1960s, used old surplus trucks, today they are professionally prepared vans, painted in party colors, with professional sound equipment. In practice, this means something between a door-to-door campaign and a street rally. For example, mass sending of advertising e-mails was not allowed. However, for the first time, private websites of candidates appeared

on a larger scale, most of them, unfortunately, quite static. This was to the advantage of the liberal democrats, whose electorate was concentrated mainly in the countryside, where direct contact is more important, and they themselves supported the law limiting campaigning on the Internet. Moreover, the use of the Internet in a campaign is rather a sign of modernity than a full-fledged tool.

The basis for maintaining the entire system of financing political activities are legal regulations. In Japan, this is primarily the Political Funds Control Act of July 29, 1948 (*Seiji Shikin Kiseihô*, known in the West as the Political Fund Control Law or Political Funds Regulation Law), which has been amended many times since its adoption. One of its fundamental features was that, since its original adoption, it introduced limits on the amount of allowable expenditure incurred for electoral purposes (*caps* in American terminology). The exact amount of permitted amounts was changed as subsequent scandals were revealed related to the financing of political activities, which involved exceeding the permitted level of spending. However, the limits on the amount of permitted expenditure on electoral activities have always remained very low. As a result, the restrictions imposed on the amount of allowed spending since the law was adopted have had no connection with reality, which means that real expenses for conducting electoral activities have always been higher than what was officially allowed (Ferdinand, 2003). The provisions of the Political Fund Control Law from 1948 allowed both political parties and individual politicians to collect funds. For many years, companies could legally make donations to political parties and individual politicians. Moreover, these donations were tax deductible. As part of gradual changes in 2000, a ban was introduced on direct financing by companies of individual politicians or official organizations supporting them (*koenkai*). From now on, companies can only support local and central party organizations with donations. In addition, a total ban on donations to political parties applies to companies that have received loans, subsidies or other types of capital support from local or national authorities (Ferdinand, 2003). Anonymous transfers of money or using the identity of another person or organization are forbidden. Non-Japanese citizens and foreign organizations and companies are also prohibited from supporting financial candidates or political parties. There is a practice of companies and organizations associated with them making donations

to political parties, but specifying which politician the party should transfer these funds to. As a result, the provision prohibiting direct financing by companies of specific politicians is, from a practical point of view, dead. At the same time, this practice allows the politician to blur his connections with a given industry or company, because in his financial report he shows that he received the funds to finance his activities directly from the party headquarters (Casas-Zamora, 2008). Issues related to deciding whether and to what extent to disclose information about a given party's finances are left to the discretion of individual organizations.

In another attempt to reform the political financing system after yet another scandal, another amendment to the law on financing of political parties was adopted in 1999, officially aimed at enforcing compliance with existing regulations. Penalties for violating the provisions of the Political Fund Control Law have been tightened. While previously the election result could be invalidated if it was proven that the candidate or the head of his election campaign was personally involved in practices contrary to the law, after the amendment, the election result may be invalidated if any person employed in running the campaign broke the law on financing political parties. Moreover, as part of the same amendment to the law on the financing of political parties and organizations, such as *koenkai*, subsidies from public funds were introduced for each political party with more than 5 representatives in parliament. Another amendment to the Political Fund Control Law introduced, starting from 2007, the obligation for all political parties to present an annual report on expenses incurred for political activities and on donations collected to finance them (financial report). Although the legislator has finally introduced the obligation to report donations and expenses, financial reports submitted by political parties and organizations are not thoroughly verified by any central government institution corresponding to the Polish National Electoral Commission or the American Federal Election Commission. Moreover, supervision over political finances itself is dispersed: supervision over central party organizations is exercised by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications. However, supervision over local party organizations (local cells of individual national political parties) is exercised by local authorities. The responsibility of politicians and studios for providing false information in financial reports is illusory.

For such an offense, the law provides for a fine of up to 1 million yen and/or periodic deprivation of public rights, but only if the prosecutor's office proves that the accused was negligent or acted to commit a crime. Otherwise, it is possible to submit a correction to the report and thus avoid criminal liability for providing incomplete or false information.

In fact, it is impossible to talk about the transparency of the system of financing political activities in Japan. Due to the structure of political parties, the electoral law and the regulatory regime in which political activities take place, despite the obligation for political organizations to submit financial reports, transparency is impossible. Moreover, it does not seem that the parties involved, i.e. politicians, state administration and donors, are interested in increasing or rather introducing elements of transparency into the system of financing political activities (Wołowiec, 2021). All the more so because there was and is widespread awareness that the restrictions imposed by law had and have no connection with political and social reality (Ferdinand 2003). Parties that supported large donors, especially big business, could count on generous donations, which was in fact a phenomenon similar to corruption. At the same time, they needed this money to finance their core activities. For much of the post-war period, the issue of visibility into political party finances, particularly what and how much information to disclose, was closely tied to the decisions of donors and recipients. Some large corporations disclosed how much they gave and to whom, but small companies mostly made donations, avoiding publicity. Apart from the still existing lack of will to make the finances of political parties public, or at least as public as can reasonably be expected, an additional obstacle to transparency is the essentially unchanged regulatory regime. Political parties can still create as many affiliated organizations (*koenkai*) as they want, and each can receive quotas allowed by the restrictions – thus all limits and restrictions imposed under the Political Fund Control Law can be flouted, in line with established practice.

CONCLUSION

Japan, which is considered the most democratic country in Asia, has had over sixty years of transformation that has brought it closer to the ideal of democracy. As the content of the article shows, showing democratic conditions, processes and mechanisms occurring within the evolution of the political system, taking into account cultural and social differences, is important for the development of Japan's democratic system. This allows not only to understand the specificity of Japanese democracy, but also to grasp the common rules characteristic of its political system and other democracies in the world. When analyzing this article, attention was paid to both the stages of formation and the nature of Japan's statehood in terms of democratic changes and their subsequent stabilization. The cultural and social distinctiveness of this country is particularly visible in relation to the genetic determinants and the system of norms and values that democracy brings. The specificity of the Japanese state system in the post-war period is manifested in the acceptance and adoption of foreign political solutions and the adaptation of existing methods of politics to them. A similar phenomenon can also be observed during the Meiji period. The post-war political system within Japan is called the 1955 System. It should be emphasized that in 1955, right-wing forces were united into one Liberal Democratic Party, which became the main force on the Japanese political scene and dominated it continuously for 38 years. In terms of external relations, Japan developed its policy within the San Francisco System, which was formed in 1951 as a result of signing a peace treaty and an alliance with the United States. The 1955 and San Francisco systems were a stable platform until the mid-1990s.

REFERENCES

- Berton, P. (2000). *The Japanese Communist Party and Its Transformations* [w:] R. J. Hrebenar *Japan's New Party System*. Westview Press, Nowy Jork.
- Casas-Zamora, K. (2008). *Paying for Democracy: Political Finance and State Funding for Parties*. ECPR Press, Colchester.
- Chmaj, M., Skrzydło, W. (2011). *System wyborczy w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*. Wolters Kluwer, Warszawa.
- Christensen, R. (2015). *The Rules of the Election Game in Japan*, [w:] R. J. Hrebenar, A. Nakamura (red.), *Party Politics in Japan: Political Chaos and Stalemate in the 21st Century*. Routledge, Londyn.
- Ferdinand, P. (2003). *Party Funding and Political Corruption in East Asia: The Cases of Japan, South Korea and Taiwan* [w:] Austin, R., Tjernström, M. *Funding of Political Parties and Election Campaigns*. International IDEA, Sztokholm.
- Kubas, S. (2011). *Konsolidacja demokracji w systemie politycznym. Przykład powojennej Japonii (1945–2010)*. Wydawnictwo REMAR, Katowice.
- McKenzie, R. (1955). *British Political Parties*. St. Martin's Press, Nowy Jork.
- Pałasz-Rutkowska E., Starecka, K. (2004). *Japonia. Historia państw świata w XX wieku*. Wydawnictwo TRIO, Warszawa.
- Sartori, G. (1976). *Parties and Party Systems. A Framework for Analysis*. ECPR Press Oksford.
- Sobolewska-Myślik, M. (2004). *Partie i systemy partyjne na świecie*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Sokół, W., Żmigrodzki, M. (2008). *Współczesne partie i systemy partyjne. Zagadnienia teorii i praktyki politycznej*. Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin.
- Tubielewicz, J. (1984). *Historia Japonii*. Ossolineum, Wrocław.
- Wołowicz, T. (2021). *Finanse publiczne. Podręcznik*, Innovatio Press, Lublin.
- Żakowski, K. (2011). *Japonia po wyborach do Izby Reprezentantów w 2009 roku*, [w:] K. Żakowski *Współczesna Azja Wschodnia. Wybrane zagadnienia*. Zakład Azji Wschodniej UŁ, Łódź.
- Żakowski, K. (2012). *Wewnątrzpartyjne uwarunkowania polityki japońskiej partii liberalno-demokratycznej wobec Chin w latach 1955 – 2006*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.
- Żmigrodzki, M. (1999). *Encyklopedia Politologii, T. 3: Partie i Systemy Partyjne*. Kantor Wydawniczy Zakamycze, Kraków.