THE PROBLEMATIC OF A DOUBLE DICTATORSHIP OF THE MAJORITY GROUP IN BRITISH DEMOCRACY

Bertin Yélindo DANSOU
National University of Agriculture, Republic of BENIN
E-mail: bertdansou@gmail.com
doi: 10.33329/elt.9.6.18

ABSTRACT

British integral, constitutional, legal and political multipartism is set in difficulties or threatened by some political leaders' styles and practices implementing this plural democracy. One of those misbehaviors and malpractices is the phenomenon of the dictatorship and double dictatorship of the majority group over the minority's rights and duties. This ,in spite of the exceptionally traditional or original principle of flexibility and tolerance, embodied in British political rule which officially offers privileged places to British opposition ,throughout shadow institutions. This remark, I have decided to carry out this analysis of which the purpose is to examine whether the rule of multipartism is respected or not. The flaws affecting the implementation of this principle and some alternative ways for the improvement of relations between the majority and the minority, without a dictatorial nor a double dictatorial injustice, have also been displayed. To reach this goal, I have used the principles and methods of New Historicism criticism to interpret or examine British political history as well as the exercise of their democracy.

Keywords: Double dictatorship, majority, minority, problematic, British democracy, shadow institutions.

Resumé

Le multipartisme politique, intégral, constitutionnel, légal britannique est plongé en difficultés ou menacé par des pratiques et styles de gestion de certains leaders politiques chargés de la mise en application de cette démocratie plurielle. L'une de ces déviances comportementales et pratiques socio-politiques est le phénomène de la dictature et de la double dictature de la majorité sur la minorité. Ceci, en dépit du principe exceptionnellement traditionnel ou original de la flexibilité et de la tolérance, incorporé au système politique britannique qui offre des positions officielles à l'opposition britannique, à travers des institutions fantômes .Au regard de ce constat, j'ai décidé de faire cette analyse dont l'objectif est de vérifier si la règle du multipartisme est respectée ou non. Les insuffisances de cette mise en œuvre et quelques solutions alternatives pour l'amélioration des relations entre la majorité et la minorité, sont aussi démontrées. Pour atteindre cet objectif, je me suis servi des principes et méthodes de la critique de la nouvelle approche historiciste, pour interpréter ou examiner l'histoire politique britannique, ainsi que le fonctionnement de leur démocratie.

Mots Clés: Double dictature, majorité, minorité, problématique, démocratie britannique, institutions fantômes.

Introduction

British democracy is one of the oldest, and the most reliable ones in the world. Nevertheless, the ruling of this system has shown, and is still demonstrating a certain number of flaws in terms of ruling it for the general interests of the people as a whole. This system of governance is said to be set for the promotion of people's freedom and other social, political and economic rights. But, in practice, these theoretical realities are betrayed by minds,behaviours and actions .This relaunches the debate of equity in the implementation of the multipartite,fair and true exercise of power on the behalf of the leaders and common citizens. The aim of this analysis is to revisit British democratic organisation and rules, from its origins up to now, with an emphasis on people's involvement in decisions making, and through the people's participation to this system that should rule the political power with the people for the people, taking into account the existence of the majority and the minority parties without discrimination nor injustice. New Historicist critical approach has oriented this analysis for which British social and political history is the focal point.

In fact, the history of British democracy has been further examined to better understand the constitutional, the legal, ideological and institutional background of their democracy from the past up to now. Democracy and the implementation of their multiparty system have been pointed out and examined with the principles of New Historicism .This British social and political history has been analysed and used to explain how a successful democracy should make cooperate the majority and the minority groups for the interests of a democracy for people. The specific history of British majority and minority parties has been used to better understand and explain,in an interpretative qualitative approach, to move from the British model to show other ideal theories and perspectives.

To carry out this history based analysis,I have read and used books, newspapers,journals and articles,mainly some government or institutional essays or other documents, hard or virtual,to get adequate data .The focal aspects which have been taken into consideration, in this analysis,are related to the exercise of political power by people in British democracy, the implementation of a just multiparty system,and the ruling of democracy,actually for people, not for an aristocratic nor a plutocratic group only,and the double dictatorship or influence of the majority party over the minority one.

To reach these expected results, two parties are devoted to the structural dimensions of the work.The first part has dealt with the meanings and true manifestations of the dictatorial majority group in political relations with the minority parties or gatherings,including the dictatorial influences of the majority over the minority.The second part has pointed out the scope of the implementation of British multi-party system in theory and in reality,highly challenged by a double dictatorship of the majority party or gatherings.From all those remarks, actual strengths and weaknesses of British democracy have been displayed with new perspectives for a better future, nationally and internationally.

I- The Concept of the Majority Group in British Democracy

1.1.   Meanings and Origins

The concept of the majority and minority groups coin with the building of parliament in which majority and minority parties are represented to make laws, control the actions of the government and take directly or indirectly an active part in the organisation and the ruling of their political system throughout the parliamentary framework. The origins of British parliament date back to the time of the approval of the Magna Carta in 1215(Oakland 8). In fact, this charter has favoured the decline of absolute power of the monarchy for the rise of the parliamentary institution. In other words, "early monarchs or political leaders in the four nations had considerable power, but generally accept advice and feudal limitations on their authority. This shows the

exercise of the royal power hands in hands with the people represented today by the Members of Parliament. It means that, in British royalty,the sense of democratic rule has been developed and accepted or even favoured by some monarchs themselves. They accepted suggestions and limitations from the other members of the society, mainly the other leaders. This principle or custom is basic and the driving force of the success of British constitutional democracy. This seemed so important, in British tradition, that when some British Kings tried to break it,they have been forced to sign the Magna Carta which officially and constitutionally limited their powers or their abuse of power. One of them is King John.(Ibid.)''…as King John (1199-1216), ignored these constraints and powerful French-Norman barons opposed John's dictatorial rule by forcing him to sign the Magna Carta in 1215" (Ibid). This document has helped to restrict the monarch's power. It has helped to force them to take advice…. Such inroads into royal powers encouraged embryonic parliament structures to be created (Ibid.).

This also helped them to build, in 1258, an English Council by disaffected nobles under Simon de Montfort, who, in 1964, summoned a broader parliament (Ibid.). These aristocratic initiatives were followed, in 1275, by the Model Parliament of Edward (1272-1307), which was the first representative English Parliament (Ibid.). It was composed of two houses, the House of Lords and the House of Commons. An independent Scottish Parliament was first created in 1326 and Ireland had a similar well established Parliament, dating from medieval times (Ibid.). Two traditional political parties formed from religious and ideological conflicts of the Civil-War by the Whigs and the Tories (Ibid. 84).

> Parliament influence grew in the eighteenth century because the Hanoverian George I lacked interest in British politics. He distrusted the Tories with their Catholic sympathies and appointed Whigs like Robert Walpole to his Privy Council. Walpole became chief Minister in 1721 and led the Whig Majority in the House of Commons. (Ibid. 85)

Ireland's Parliament then achieved legislative independence in 1782. It represented only the privileged Anglo-Irish minority and the Roman Catholic majority were excluded. "In 1801, Ireland was united with Great Britain by the Act of the Union to form the UK. The Irish Parliament was abolished and members sat in both houses in the London Parliament" (Ibid.).

From this historical information about British political system, the development of British two major parties, the Tories and the Whigs are found out connected to the concepts of the majority and that of the minority. It is obvious that traditionally, it exists struggle between the majority and the minority for the control of the political system. In the past, military forces, strategic forces and political or economic influences were the great weapons used by one or the other group to control the system. But, with the reinforcement of the parliamentary actions, votes or voting have become the most important weapons for the majority to impose their will upon the minority. The majority is then understood as a group of leaders whose political party holds the greater number of seats in the House of Commons (Evans, I. Eric 2). The party who holds a fewer number of seats in the House of Commons gathers the leaders of the minority group.

1.2. Majority versus Minority Parties

Majority, here, should be understood as a gathering of political leaders in a party who won a greater number of seats in the House of Commons from the general election: "The general election selects individuals. However, political party's organisation and discipline are so extensive that, it is almost impossible for a candidate to be elected who does not represent a major party.It is then clear that once elected from a list of a party, an individual becomes a personality who represents the whole party and think or act on the behalf of the party members and of the whole society whatever the conditions:'' When they get to Westminster, they are expected

to vote according to party loyalty rather than personal preference and conviction when these clash" (Ibid. 2). The concept of majority and a majority group then equal the majority party.

This majority joins,"the term parliamentary majority which is used to refer to the number of seats by which the winning party beats the combined total number of seats obtained by all the other parties' winning seats".(Ibid). As illustrations: The Labour Party led by Tony Blair won the general election in 2001, with a massive majority of 167 seats versus 147 seats in 1997. In comparison to this party, the Conservative Party obtained its greatest majority since the World War II, with Margaret Thatcher in 1983, obtaining 144 seats (Pickard 2). It is important to learn that the majority is determined not with fifty percent of the popular vote, it is rather the number of constituencies won that is important (Ibid.).This electoral modus operandi makes it difficult to the minor parties to win constituencies and control the system.

Nevertheless, to help smaller parties have their representatives in the House of Commons, the Liberal Democrat Party called for Proportional Representation (PR), which is also part of the process, through which small parties can hold their representation in the House of Commons (Ibid.). Sometimes and according to political realities, political alliances are accepted, when required, to form or to reinforce British majority. Let's mention an alliance between the Liberal Party and Social Democratic Party in 1980s that merged to become the Liberal Democrats. With this alliance system, they formed, in the 1980s, the third-largest party in the UK's politics but they lack substantial representation in the House of Commons (Ibid.). This aspect of political alliances shows the flexible aspects of British constitutional and legal system; which can build and rebuild majority-minority structure or shape.

The two-party system has arisen incidentally in the United Kingdom and it has become deeply embedded in British political structure .It has highly influenced British constitutional body .It has ensured stable and parliamentary system of government.(Bhagwan et al. 101).''Englang does not love coalitions'',,'' is an old but a widely accepted maxim. 'Even the constitution itself was developed under the two-party system and 'does its best to compel it'''.(Ibid.).

The concept of minority is referred to as a political party which wins less seats than the majority party for the House of Commons, during the general election. That is the largest opposition party. This party is the one who wins more seats than other opposition groups. In 1906, the Labour Party became the main opposition party to the Conservative (Ibid. 8). The other smaller parties take part in the ruling of the system through their representation in the House of Commons: "Smaller parties are also represented in the House of Commons, such as the Scottish National Party, Plaid Cymru (the Welsh National Party), the Ulster Unionists and the Democratic Unionists (Protestant Northern Irish Parties), the Social Democratic and the Labour Parties (moderate National Roman Catholic Mother Irish Party), and Sinn Fein Republican Irish Party. Other smaller parties like the Green Party, the British National Party (BNP), the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP)" (Ibid. 106).

It is then clearly noticed that either on the majority side or the minority one, British Constitution system permits the gathering of parties to form the majority group or the minority one, provided they share the same ideology, the same philosophical line or social and political interests. The concept of minority is highly rooted in British social and political realities. Their rights and duties are highly subject to a close attraction in social and political organisation, and decisions making: "Even in 2005, the House of Commons, which has a historically unprecedented number of women and ethnic minority MPs, is a distorted mirror of British Society (Cole 6)''. This political strategy has been the source of much criticism and inspiration of the Commons, in recent years, in British electoral system, all main parties have made specific efforts to encourage greater numbers of successful parliamentary candidates who are women or from ethnic minorities. (Matt 6).

 In this vein, a social composition of the House of Commons, in May 2005, showed in the House of Commons, 15 actual number of MPs and 51 representative number of MPs (Ibid. 7). It is then understood that two main and well extended antagonist political forces build and control the ruling of British democratic system: The majority and the minority, including their associated allies. This idea is well justified with this assertion by Dr Jennings:''The Prime Minister knows more the leader of the opposition than his own wife.'(Bhagwan,Op. Cip. 101).

Nevertheless, the main preoccupation is to know if the majority actually respect the rights and duties of the minority or the others for the general interests of the people. The influence of ethnic groups and social organisations is determining in the building of political parties. The case of the composition of the House of Commons in May 2005 is more illustrative. (Ibid.).Despite different strategies to brake power abuse in British democracy,the dictatorship of the majority is still noticed and subject to various debates.

1.3.   The Dictatorship of the Majority

The word dictatorship originated in ancient Rome, '' a political rule by a person or a group of people who set an arbitrary use of power to manage administrations, with or against the will of populations.''(Gandhi 2); and "… in its original conception, dictatorship had a very distinct and specific meaning: rule by a leader who was selected by a Consul in Rome to govern during periods of emergency when external or internal rebellions threatened the existence of politics" (Ibid. 4,5). The term "dictator" was to last no more than six months, and he could not remain in power after the Consul who appointed him stepped down. During this specific time in power the dictator was authorised to use whatever power was deemed necessary to deal with the crisis at hand with the goal of restoring the old constitutional order (Ibid. 5).The original meaning of dictatorship coins with a short time of social and political crisis with an exceptional use of iron discipline, and to use all powers in hand to make order. It means that the original philosophical meaning of dictatorship is a system of governance that is exceptionally set for a short time to restore order and peace for a continual development of the society. The play, Julius Caesar by William Shakespeare is an illustrative aspect of roman dictatorship, with its full content of political betrayal.

From this historical meaning of dictatorship, practices and use make various forms of dictatorial regimes. They are authoritarian, totalitarian, tyrannical, autocratic, despotic, military, personalist, neopatrimonialist and other non democratic regimes. From these various and linguistic understandings of dictatorial regimes, it is necessary to make differences between forms of dictatorship with the types of discipline and rigorous measures or rules in a political or social rule. Any Abusive, illegal or illegitimate use of force or power in social or political rule is dictatorship as well as a regime showing these characteristics. In other words, dictatorship, as a political system, is a systemised system of government in which a single person or a small group of persons exercise complete power over the others in a society. A dictator does not inherit power like a king or queen. A dictator either seizes control by force, or is placed into position of authority by the other members of the society.

An extreme or absolute use or exercise of power by a dictator leads him or her to totalitarianism, authoritarianism, despotism, with sometimes many sub-forms all over the world: " Traditional classifications have recognised even if implicitly that these dictatorial regimes differ in their organisation and bases of support.

British dictatorship of the majority is expressed throughout the influences of the majority group in the parliament in making laws, controlling the actions of the government and the whole political system,directly or indirectly. Voting procedures, in the House of Commons,are influenced by the majority group as well as the implementing of decisions in the executive.The Prime Minister is the leader of the majority group of the

parliament as well as most of the other ministers who come from this majority.They then influence the making of laws as well as their implementation process in the government.Even shadow institutions, constitutionally or legally set to brake some power abuse are less effective for.

This makes British democracy useful for a group of persons not the whole people.Democracy by people for people then has far way to go, if people's legitimate representation are still vain words, in spite of the fact that the system is said democratic or constitutional monarchy.

The gathering of the majority party rule British democratic system with the direct or indirect and critical contribution of the minority, in close social and political relation with the monarchy. This majority influence the decisions or votes of the House of Commons, of the executive and that of the House of Lords and other institutions: "People living in Britain in the last quarter of the twentieth century are accustomed to a political system in which power is exercised by leaders of that political party which currently holds the greatest number of seats in the House of Commons" (Evan 1).This also means that today even in the twenty first century British political system is ruled and controlled by the majority group in power.

It is then highly shown that British political system is highly influenced by the leaders of the majority group, in relations with the Queen before, sometimes, the powerless criticism of the minority party: "UK governments are able to pass their policies through Parliament because of large majorities in the House of Commons. This means that there are few parliamentary restraints upon a strong government" (Oakland 92). This influence of the majority group in the House of the Commons is reinforced by UK government and administrative bodies too centralized and secretive (Oakland 93). It is seen that British political and administrative systems are controlled by small groups or bodies which are unelected and are appointed by government (Ibid). Before these political practices, there is almost absence of constitutional and political safeguards for citizens against State power before very few legal, political and social definitions and practices of civil liberties or human rights.

Nevertheless, and to restrain such a view, the previous Labour government created a Freedom of Information Act in 2000 and incorporated the European Convention into British law by the creation of Human Rights Act, 1998. These efforts have helped to improve the civil and constitutional rights of British people (Ibid). However, it is heard that this measure of control can still be manipulated by authorities. The Human Rights Act is having a controversial effect on many levels (Ibid). " Critics still feel that the British parliamentary system is outdate, and claim that the UK political system no longer work satisfactorily" (Ibid 94). This clearly means that British democratic system needs to be reformed and update to fit the current and modern complexity of society. In other words, democracy which is a system in which peoples select their representatives to vote, make laws and act on their behalf for the development of all has come to a step at which the majority group exercise a dictatorship over the other parts of the society. In the context of the UK's democracy, this dictatorship is double because of the control of the three branches of power by the leaders of the majority group in or from the House of Commons.

II-The Problematic of a Double Dictatorship in British Democracy

2.1- A Double Dictatorship of the Majority Group: Rules, Procedures, Behaviors, and Practices.

The concept "dictatorship" in British democracy has been inspired by procedures, actions and strategies which have shown the influence, the force and the manipulations of the majority against the minority or the whole of the population. Dictatorship in a democracy is a contrast. A dictatorial regime is normally different from a democratic one. In a dictatorship, no freedom of speech, of thought or actions is tolerated without a strict control, without high regulations or pressures. They may be limited to a strict minimum with set

orientations. In this context, rights to freedom of speech or of press are sometimes neglected. Human and civil rights are also broken.

Dictatorship, most of the time coins with an iron discipline in controlling all the social and political fields of a country. This, without moderation can turn a democracy into a dictatorship. If it reaches an extreme level, it can be called a totalitarian, an autocratic, a despotic or an authoritarian regime. This can become an absolute exercise of power. A well set democracy can, likewise, be turned into a despotic or an absolute regime, if the social and political psychology of the leaders does not fit the respect of human and civil rights and duties of populations. An illustration is the allegorical Animal Farm (Orwell 2010) where the democratic governance by the people has been turned into a totalitarian regime by a small group led by Napoleon.

This simply means that all democratic regimes are said to be set and ruled for peoples. It is rather the psychology and some political practices of certain leaders which make them change the constitutional and democratic institutions or principles into totalitarian or despotic ones against the peoples they represent and whom they should serve. It is then obvious that in a democracy, one can actually notice dictatorial influences, behaviors or practices, either in smallest or greatest democracies. Another aspect is that, even if all the institutions are set democratic, political rule and practices can become dictatorial against democratic rules. This aspect makes notice in British democracy the higher influence of the majority leaders against the interest of the minority or of the whole people. Reading the way it happens in British democracy, the dictatorship of the majority is seen double.

In fact, the double dictatorship or the double influence of British democracy resides in the quasi total control of the executive and the legislative branches of power by the majority. Thus, the leader of the majority party in the House of Commons becomes the Prime Minister and the Head of Cabinet. The power of the majority has led to the reinforcement of the parliamentary influence which "grew in the early eighteenth century" (Oakland 1985). One of the British former Prime Ministers, Walpole has been an illustrative figure (Ibid.). "He became Chief Minister in 1721 and has led the Whig Majority in the House Commons … He increased the parliamentary role and has been called Britain's first Prime Minister" (Ibid).

This clearly adds to the understanding that the British leaders having influence on the House of Commons and on the Parliament, still hold powers of manipulations on the executive power that they rule with the consent and the advice of the Monarch. The leader of the legislative becomes leader of the executive, with this reality of a double political influence; making the laws and implementing them. The Prime Minister appoints all the members of the cabinet who come in majority from the House of Commons (Ibid 88, 89). British majority doubly dominates the legislative and the executive, with the contribution of high appointed civil servants in the House of the Lords. Even the responsibility of the members of the cabinet should be appreciated or influenced by the members of the majority group of the House of Commons. These aspects of British political system simply show the double dictatorship of the same leaders belonging to the majority influencing the making of the laws and the implementation of those rules.

If the psycho-philosophical understanding of democracy aims at establishing a system in which social and political justice should be established safeguarding the duties and the rights of the majority and that of minority for development, practices in democracy lead to other abuses. This happens consciously or unconsciously as in British context where the practices betray the philosophical meaning and rules of a true democracy with the sovereignty to the people. "Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-82) whose key work, The Social Contract (1762) argued that sovereignty could not be transferred to other persons, and only personal participation in the making of laws could ever allow men to be free" (Matt 48).

Rousseau explained that systems under the title of democracy, assuming them to involve government by self-interested majority over a minority, a structure he perceived to be impractical as well as improper (Ibid.). He further makes understand, as one of the pioneers of the theory of modern democracy, that the true sovereign authority of the people is the general will (Ibid.). He adds that the general will of a majority group, even a unanimous one, may not reflect the general will (Ibid.). This obviously shows that in a democratic rule, the respect of the rights and duties of the minority is a challenging issue before the high influence of the majority group. This leads to the betrayal of the intrinsic meaning of the majority ruling with the critical contribution of the minority.

2.2- The Rights and Duties of the Minority before the Majority Rule

In British Democracy, the minority is a reality. They are coordinated by the opposition party. They represent the political party that wins a lesser number of seats during a general election. Traditionally, British party system opened during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with all its implications (Bhagwan et. Al. 10). "The minority in Parliament were no more known as the King's enemies but as 'Her Majesty's loyal opposition'" (Ibid.). This party has offered many changes in British constitutional edifice and the psychology of this country's politics during the past 200 years (Ibid.). Many other changes have taken place during the Stuart era in giving opportunities to the minority to exercise, with thoughts, voice, and actions, their critical contribution to the ruling of British democracy. This happens through shadow institutions in the government and in the parliament.

The presence and the role of British opposition are part and parcel of British constitution (Ibid. 108). The opposition, in England, is as organised as the government itself. It is officially recognised (Ibid.). Its leader gets an annual salary charged on consolidated funds. He has a room in the same corridor as those of the Ministers. He stands side by side with the Prime Minister when the Monarch opens the Parliament. He is the alternative Prime Minister. The practice of a British organised and officially recognised opposition is a reality in the UK. (Ibid.).

Her Majesty's opposition, in England, plays an important role in the actual administration of the government. It keeps the government always on toes and thus on the right track. They learn from the criticism of the opposition than from the Treasury benches. It helps more with its constructive, not destructive, sound criticism in the parliament and other shadow institutions. It criticises the arbitrary acts of the government and exposes their infirmities (Ibid. 09).

To show the importance of opposition in breaking the dictatorship or the double dictatorship of the majority, Quintin and Hogg observed: "It is not a long step from the absence of an organised opposition to a complete dictatorship." (Ibid 109).Opposition in the UK seldom plays a destructive or obstructive role. In times of national crisis, it always cooperates with the government, owing to some fundamentals on which parties agreed. "The formation of government by Churchill during the World War II stands witness to this fact of agreement on fundamentals" (Ibid.)

On humiliating defeat consecutively the second time in 2001, the leader of the opposition stepped down saying: "It was vital for leaders to listen". After a third consecutive defeat of his party in 2005 elections, the leaders of the opposition, Michael Howard tendered resignation despite getting his party some of the lost glory before all the results came in. "He took the plea that he was sixty three and will be too old at the next elections."(Ibid.) It is then obvious that British democratic system has been set taking into account a certain number of psychological, sociological, political and economic aspects in their sense of consensus for national unity around the development of their country.

2.3- Strengths, Weaknesses of British Democracy and New Perspectives

British democratic culture dates back from the remote history of their peoples, inherited from Greek, Roman and Anglo-Saxon traditions. Constitution is the cornerstone of the setting and ruling of a democratic system. British constitution gave the main and historical orientations of political deals, reforms and struggles for the gradual creation of a centralised state, the UK, which owned much to English models of government structure: ''the Executive, the Legislative and the Judiciary'' (Oakland, Op. Cit. 2). These periods of basic democratic cultures were also those of violent upheavals and ideological, tribal, royal, religious, civil and nationalist conflicts for a genuine democracy protecting human or people's rights and duties (Ibid.)

People's rights to freedom and actions have become the most important issue before the influence of the monarchy. The Magna Carta has become a constitutional revolution to reduce the influence of the powers of the monarch to reinforce people's rights and duties in contributing to the ruling of the country. Some powers of the monarch are transferred to the Parliament or shared with it for the general interest of the people. This also facilitated political representation in British democracy.

Originally, the term representation meant the represented of an intangible quality or force, such as religious faith, or physical courage …. Only later, particularly following the Renaissance, was considered possible to represent people or their particular ideas in political institutions. (Cole op. Cit. 4).

Democratic attitude and culture then go along with the political history of the UK. However, the question of the general interest, and the actual rights and duties of the minority beyond the political theory still need to be revisited in terms of adequate rules, actions, strategies and practices. Added to the roles played by British opposition, its status needs to be reinforced in terms of representation in political institutions to allow it to offer its critical and constructive contribution to the ruling of the system. The frequency of their intervention in decisions sessions may be increased to favour the use of the positive sides of their thoughts, strategies and actions.

Nevertheless, it should be strictly checked in its criticism according to the legal and constitutional demands of the country. Sometimes, the interest of the opposition parties is not that of the people. Beyond the voice of the opposition, the voices of the common peoples' representation are necessary for the ruling of power for the people in democracy; if we don't want to betray the true linguistic, philosophical, sociological, psychological and political meanings of a democratic system. An advantage in British democracy is that, they succeeded in associating the opposition to the ruling of the system, even if efforts remain to make.

But, a part of the people: workers, women and other social groups, non-politicians should be more represented in the system, through well set laws or constitutional acts. They seem voiceless in a regime where politicians think and act in their place and on their behalf, sometimes unfairly. Opposition should, likewise, be taught the true roles of a responsible opposition, helpful to the sustainable development of the country. Opposition should be seen as an enemy to the majority leading a democracy. If the majority's influence over the executive should be regulated before a victimised l opposition, thus opposition should neither abuse of its status of a critical institution to cheat with the democratic rules.

These social and political complexities in the ruling of British democracy is an advance over other democratic regimes, mainly the democratic regimes which should learn from this practice. This can happen through a certain number of aspects to improve and to make people benefit from democracy with its originally linguistic, philosophical, sociological and psychological dimensions. From the word democracy, different practices, many difficulties occur. Theorists and leaders should take them into account to accept flexible and tolerable revisiting of texts and practices, according to the development of each society.

Whether democracies are liberal or representative today, they require more than just competitive elections, They rather and also require the enforcement of legal restraint on state power, protection of civil rights, the establishment of relatively incorrupt and effective bureaucracies, and the imposition of democratic control over potentially authoritarian forces such as the military and the security services.(Hague and Harrop 43).The question of legitimate and fair democracies is raised. The unfair implementation of democratic multiparty system can break people's rights and duties and turn democracies themselves into illegitimate, illegal and unfair systems from inside and even impacting political external environments. British democracy constitutes a step ahead with its culture of flexibility and tolerance in associating opposition parties to political debates, even if many other efforts need to be made to come to the reality of the rule of this democracy for the interests of all the parties of the system and for the whole society.

Social democratic theory has put a focus on some important aspects of challenges and perspectives to frame for a democracy useful for socio-economic development and personal or social welfare:'' In fact, social democratic theory has been primarily concerned with searching for applying a strategy which viewed the welfare state and full employment policies as necessary preconditions for a socialist transformation of society that was envisaged to be based on a modified capitalist economy.''(Roder 11).People's rights and duties promotion in liberal or representative democracies are connected to some demands of representative democracies which is therefore said '' normative assumptions about legitimacy, authorisation, accountability and control.'' (Judge 3). Both the majority and the minority have moral and political duty to work in the vein of these dimensions to make democratic regimes actually successful.

 Conclusion

The concept of dictatorship is polysomic according to the context of its implementation. It may be used positively or negatively. It is idem with the handling of democracy. The context and the use determine the new orientations of the concept in close relations with the original meaning. A well-established dictatorship can be turned into democracy vice versa. British absolute monarchy has been changed into a constitutional democratised monarchy. The monarch cooperates well with the parliament, and is even said to be part of this institution according to the principle of '',The Queen-in-Parliament, i.e. The Queen, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons, constitute the law-making body in Britain.''(Appadorai 259). Dictatorship constitutes some minds, some ideas, some behaviours, some practices and actions .It is idem for democracy. Contexts and conditions may also determine the totalitarian or democratic forms of a regime.

Relations and interrelations of the majority parties with the minority parties in a political regime also depend on the leaders' minds, behaviours, actions and practices in respecting constitutional, legal and ideological principles taking into account traditional and modern contexts and conditions to improve the present and the future. Political morality or ethics in politics is then called on. Political morality is '' the moral conviction and commitments that govern decisions about what laws to enact, what principles to pursue''(Perry 1).This political morality should also take into consideration people's dimensions (leaders' and common citizens') aptitudes and capacities in accompanying the implementation of political rules and strategies: ''The dualism found in nearly all aspects of a democratic cultural climate leads us to the conclusion that the structure of a democratic way of life is defined by two dimensions, one ideal and transcendental, the other empirical and immanent''.(Barbu 65).

In politics, we can conclude that practices make the meaning. That is why political practices should be set according to the constitutional, legal and ideological rules of the system, set in morality, not to turn the meaning of the concept away, far from its linguistic, philosophical and psychological orientations. Following British steps, political and democratic rules, policies and practices should include flexibility and adaptability to fit the daily

demands of change in democratic rule. However, this approach should not lead to anarchy against people's general interest. Ideal political morality is to be identified in the present contexts of the world's political or democratic incongruities. Political morality' 'would just be what morality requires us to do plus any items that are special to the political domain''.(Vernon 35).

Bibliography

[1].   Appadorai, A.*The Substance of Politics*. India /New Delhi : Oxford University Press.1968.

[2].   Barbu,Zevedei.*Democracy and Dictatorship :Their Psychology and Paterns of Life.*New York :Routledge Tailor and Francis Group,1956,Reprinted,2002.

[3].   Bhagwan et al.,*World Constitutions :A Comparative Study.*India :Sterling Publishers Private Limited,Tenth Revised and Enlarged Edition.2013.

[4].   Blair, Tony*. Prime Minister's Speech on Public Service Reform*. London, 16. October, 2001.

[5].   Coady, J A C .*Morality and Political Violence*, Cambridge :Cambridge University Press, 2008.

[6].   Cole,Matt.*Democracy in Britain* .Edinburgh :Edinburgh University Press.2006.

[7].   Evans,J.Eric.*Political Parties in Britain 1783-1867* .USA :Methuen and Co in association with Methuen Inc.29 west 35 th,1985 .

[8].   Gandhi,Jennifer.*Political Institutions under Dictatorship*. Cambridge,New York,Melbourne,Madrid,Cape Town,Singapore, Sao Paulo :Cambridge University Press.2008.

[9].   Hague, Rod et Harrop,Martin. *Comparative Government and Politics :An Introduction,*6th Edition.England :Palgrave Macmillan.2004.

[10].   Hare, R H.*Essays on Political Morality*,USA-Oxford :Clarendon Press :Oxford University Press, 1998 ;

[11].   Johari, J C .Comparative Politics .India :Sterling Publishers Privated Limited. 2013.

[12].   Judge, David.*Democratic Incongruities :Representative Democracy in Britain.*United Kingdom and USA :Palgrave Macmillan.2014..

[13].   *Modern Language Association Handbook for Writers of Research Papers,Seventh Edition* :New York, 2009 .

[14].   Oakland John .*British Civilization : An Introduction*, Seventh Edition,London and New York : R Routledged Tailor and Francis Group.2011.

[15].   Orwell,,George *.Animal Farm*. UK /Nigeria :Longman Literature,2010.

[16].   Perry, Michael J..*The Political Morality of Liberal Democracy*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singaore, Sao Paulo, Delhi, Dubai,Tokyo :Cambridge University Press.2010.

[17].   Pickard,Sarah.*Civilisation Britannique(British Civilisation*).Paris :Université Paris III,La Sorbonne Nouvelle.2005.

[18].   Roder,Knut. *Social Democracy and Labour Market Policy Developments in Britain and in Germany*.London and New York : Routledge Tailor and Francis Group.2003.

[19].   Shakespeare, William.*Julius Ceasar* edited by Barbara A Mowat and Paul Werstine,London :Folger Shakespeare Library.http://Shakespeare folger.edu

[20].   Stout, Larry *.Time for a Change*.USA :Destiny Image Publishers,Inc.2006.

[21].   Vernon,Richard .*Political Morality : A Theory of Liberal Democracy*. London : British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data,2001.

[22].   Bhagwan,Vishnoo .*World Constitutions :A comparative Study*,Tenth Revised and Enlarged Edidition, Reprinted 2013.

Web references

[23].   www.sterlingpublishers.com/ e-mail :mail@sterlingpublishers.com, *World Constitutions :A Comparative Study*, 2013.

[24].   www.sterlingpublishers.com/ e-mail :mail@sterlingpublishers.com,*Comparative Politics,* 2013.

[25].   www.mlahandbook.org, *MLA Handbook*,2009.

[26].   www.Companion website,*British Civilization :An introduction*.2011.

[27].   www.cambridge.org Perry Michael.*The Political Morality of Liberal Democracy,*2010.

[28].   www.cambridge.org. Gandhi Jennifer*. Political Institutions under Dictatorship.*2008.

[29].   www.routledge.com.Oakland,John.*British Civilisation :An Introduction*.2011.

[30].   www.sterlingpublishers.com.Bhagwan et al..*World Constitutions :A Comparative Study.* Tenth Revised and Enlarged Edition.2013.

[31].   www.shakespeare folder.edu.*The Tragedy of Julius Caesar by William Shakespeare.* Folger Shakespeare Library. 2010.