CHAPTER II

"EVOLUTION OF OPPOSITION IN A PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT: U.K. & FRANCE"

To know the evolution of opposition in Parliamentary system of government it is useful to understand the development of political parties in United Kingdom and France, where the parliamentary system of government happen to be the oldest of all parliamentary forms of government, possessing the two-party system and multi-party system of political parties accordingly.

Organised opposition is an essential feature of western democracy. Many examples of "organized opposition" might be discussed in the course of history. In the time of the Republic of Rome, where there was limited democracy, the creation of the clubs, provided with the right of intercourse, corresponds exactly to the same idea or notion. Later church played this kind of role towards the feudal monarchy of the middle ages. From the eighteenth century onwards the function of the opposition were no longer separately organised, and rivalry was established in the ranks of the latter with the idea of limiting power by power. The institution of Assembly, with its two chambers, the idea of separation of power in the form of separation of legislature from executive powers corresponds the same notion. The contemporary development of political parties, while simultaneously modifying the classic
separation of powers has transformed the function of the opposition. Minority parties are the terms of the tribunes of the Clubs.

But in Britain, the origin of the British party system can be traced back a long way. Two of the British parties in existence today, the "Conservative and Liberals, are generally regarded as having a continuous ties from the Tories and 'Whigs' of the reign of Charles II. The opposition of 'Whigs' and 'Tories' certainly had arisen of the strife of 'Round heads' and 'Cavaliers' during the Civil War. Although we may not call the Round heads and 'Cavaliers' as political parties in the modern sense of term. The party system had undoubtedly taken shape after 1679, where the members of parliament, who supported the Bill to exclude James, Duke of York from the throne were dubbed 'Whigs' and those who opposed it were named 'Tories' . The Tory party supported the church and the king. The Whigs supported the parliament and advocated religious tolerance. Whigs in both leadership and opinion, relied for its support on the religious dissenters and the prosperous monied class, while

'Tories' support mainly came from the Anglican land-owners. The groupings were nothing like political parties in the modern sense of word. There were cliques or the organised of the feudal nobility, and their hangers on both inside the parliament and out side the parliament. They were however, the beginning of a new conservative way of harnessing political energies. And it was only a matter of time before the whole machinery of state was to be taken over by fully fledged party organisation.

Throughout the later half of the seventeenth century, parties were like warring factions and were in bitter mutual animosities led by the religious divisions and reinforced by the conflict of the commercial and landed interests and conceivably also by corresponding social antipathies. But the Revolution was exception to this when all the parties, Whigs, Tories, Anglicans and Dissenters were united nation wide opposition for the common cause of preventing England to be 'Papist'. Because people may tolerate a catholic King or Queen provided that they had preferred to worship as catholic in private. But they opposed all attempts to supress the formation and made Catholicism a state religion.

4. Ibid., p.69.
The contemporary development of parties dated from the constitutional settlement within which the institution of Cabinet-Government and official opposition eventually developed, then followed the civil war of the seventeenth century. After the 'Glorious Revolution', the landed aristocratic dominated the society and Britain was becoming the business nation and was engaged in a long war with France. It required the political and religious tolerance so that Britain may boast of British liberties, as compared with France. Thereafter the tendency of political differences and religious controversies were tolerated with impartiality for reluctant realisation of Uniformity. Which is clear from S.R. Gardiner's remark that Charles II made in Breda and declared that "No man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion."

Thus, after constitutional settlement, the period was of political exhaustion, material prosperity increased and great issue to stir up public opinion were conspicuous by their absence. Good things have been achieved in the struggle of the old 'Tories' and 'Whigs'. Religious differences had become less acute, safeguarding of the reformation settlement in the Church of England with toleration alike for Roman

---


Catholic and 'Protestants' dissenters. The establishment of
the king's position as a constitutional sovereign, the defi-
nition of his relation with parliament, and the development of
the representative government have now become the common
purpose of all parties.

Once the supremacy of parliament was established in
the constitutional settlement of the late seventeenth century,
the problem arose of relating the conduct of administration
to opinion in parliament in some regular way. The solution
was a Cabinet government controlling administration and
commanding the confidence of a majority in the house of Commons
against its opponent in the Chamber. From the resotration
it compelled the monarch at least to consider the ability of
ministers to manage parliament, was an element in politicians
calculations. This made it worth while to attempt to marshal
opposition in parliament against particular ministers or their
policies through most of eighteenth century. The king ministers
maintained themselves in parliament as the court party against
the active and hostile politicians of the country party. The
majority of whose members however, were not playing for office
and, though independent of the court, were not generally
unfriendly to ministerial policy. The court and country
parties were kaleidoscopic combination of family and other
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personal connections, Whigs and 'Tories' alike active politicians, supporting or 'opposing' the court in accordance with the immediate political interests of the groups to which they belonged. The differences between them were imprecise, and the boundaries of political affiliation constantly fluctuated. There is hardly a trace of party programmes or party organisation. The result of elections did not turn on party allegiance, but on a man's connections with those who controlled the nominations. The originally opprobrious nick names, 'Whigs and 'Tories', given in derision reciprocally, date from the time of Lord Shaftesbury's country party, in the 1670 and 80, and though they persisted as the main political denominators for a century and half soon lost most of what ever value they had as differentiating indicators of political behaviour.

The theory of parliamentary supremacy was combined with the practical leadership of the king and his ministers. They had the support of placeman in the house. They attached groups to themselves by patronages and contracts. Corruption also ensured that they gained more supports from elections than did their opponents. But for their majority ministers
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had to obtain the approval of enough independent members. Opposition politicians sought to harness ministers sufficiently to be bought off, or to induce the King to replace one or more of his ministers. Thus there was no formed majority and no formed opposition.

Both started to emerge in the late eighteenth century. There was an urgent demand of Whigs of eliminating the abuse of influence used by the crown through administrative reforms which could be possible by the decline of North adopting the practice of motion of "no confidence". The Whig revolution of 1780 moved by Dunning that the power of the Crown has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished......Its aim was only to eliminate the influence of the Crown from the legislature and not to weaken that of the great political patrons, still less to strengthen the influence of the people. After that the ministerial policy began to be based on public political attitude because the difference of opinion about public policy grew more important. An increasing number of social, economic conditions produced by the industrial revolution and political interests articulated the issues. This meant that the question of parliamentary reforms was bound to be raised. Reforms reduced the influence
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of patronage and contracts, and completed the transition to responsible government, which had in essence been demanded by the Long Parliament in the Ground Remonstrance of 1641. In 1641 for the first time, the opposition won a general election and the crown accepted the decision at the polls.

Further, the beginning of the nineteenth century was marked for multi-party system. Every party, adherents used such numbers of parliament who voted with the government rather their own body. Few liked to be termed as 'party men'. The leaders of a party, were thus loose entities which grew up around Cabinet rather than well defined organisation which could produce them. Yet political feelings were clearly marked and it was usually evident that a given house of Commons was more likely to support minister of a certain political colour. The development of parties was inevitably complex. The division between parties was never so trivial that it made politics a game for the prize of office, nor so fundamental that the one desired to destroy the other. The slow extension of the franchise meant that a happy mean between a friendly game and a war of classes was maintained.

17. Ibid., p. 72.
The Reform Act of 1832 was the great landmark in the history of British party system. It is this that the parties in the modern sense of the term began. "The changes which is brought about in the parties is reflected in their nomenclature from this time, 'Tories' began to call themselves Conservatives and 'Whigs' began to call themselves liberals. The Conservatives emphasise the value of tradition and his preference for natural growth to artificial creation, holding with one of his early predecessors, that if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change. The liberals look favourably on all changes tending in the direction of free institution. The Whig would have government corrupt and the church subordinate to the state so that the people should be safeguarded against despotism and begotry. The Conservative desired a strong government and was prepared to reform the strength, but he looked to the Church as a bulwark against the lower orders.

There were no party organisations in or outside the parliament before 1832. Every great house was a centre of 'Tories', and 'Whigs' political activities. If a man wished to become a candidate for parliament he had to make his own arrangements. The electorate was small and very often there
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was some powerful patron, described as the prevailing influence that determined how a majority of electors would vote. But the complexity of the formation stimulated the development of parties. The reform Bill of 1832 provided for registrations of those qualified to vote, made their way into the constituencies and gradually covered the whole country by the network of their organization. There were many qualified electors who did not care to have their names on the list. There were also many cases of attempt by unqualified electors to get on the list, and of course, there were many doubtful cases. In these circumstances it became a matter of great importance to the parties to ensure that in every constituency their own qualified supporters were duly registered and that all unqualified supporters of their opponents were removed from the registers. For this purpose in 1841 as a result of Peel's encouragement, "Registration association, began to be set up in the country to ensure the registration of qualified electors of crown conservative views, and the Whig, liberals did likewise. This was the modest beginning of the vast party

organisation covering the whole country that we know today. Every successive enlargement of the electorate in 1867, in 1884, in 1918 and in 1929 increased the necessity for the nationwide organization of parties.

Well organized and large central parties as we know today also date from this period needed from the start, a full time professional bureaucracy to run them, on permanent basis not only at the election time but continuously. A new stage in the development of parties was thus reached the communication of information. Propaganda and the persuasion of the electorate was planned by experienced professions. As a result the parties central office controlled the selection and nomination of candidates, since the end of the last century elections have taken the form of huge campaigns fought out between huge party mechanisms, centrally led and tactically directed by the autonomous manager of the central party agencies. The traditions of the unopposed seat come to an end. It also became the practice for party leader to go into battle themselves at the head of their parties. When Gladstone did so in his Midlothian campaign in 1879, he created a precedent. In England the party leaders was visible embodiments of their

party and dominates the political scene. British election today thus takes on the character of plebiscite for one or the other leader. Robert Dahl is right when he asserts that the Parliamentary political parties thereafter (1867-second reforms etc.) took the lead in mass political organization, the party labels became increasingly important in election and the independence of M.Ps. was considerably reduced, and the connection between election and cabinet was established, when the electorate was almost doubled and the constituencies was made more uniform by the second reform Act.

But the evolution of the British political parties in the era of the mass electorate has witnessed two striking developments. Until well into the nineteenth century the conservative party was no more than a grouping of a few hundreds members of parliament and peers who were associated together for sustaining a conservative cabinet. They had no professional staff and organization and relied on the allegiance and authority of the squirearchy and the generous financial contributions of a section of the business community. But two developments forced the conservative party to transform itself. The first was the rapid expansion of the electorate especially in 1867 and afterwards; and the second,
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the drastic tightening of the electoral laws against corruption.

Secondly the transformation of the labour party in the half century of its existence has been in one sense diametrically different from that of the conservative, although the end product is strangely similar. A gathering representing some hundreds of thousands of organized trade unions and a few thousands members of socialist societies decided in 1900 to co-operate together to secure increased working class representation in the house of commons, which was the outcome of industrial revolution. They soon found it necessary to instruct their representatives in parliament to form themselves into what amounted to a parliamentary party. That parliamentary party began increasingly to resemble the other great parliamentary parties as it came to rival them in the size and strength thus christended in 1906. By the time parliamentary labour party had taken office in: 1924 its transformation was almost complete.

But it cannot be accepted that neither her Majesty's government, nor her Majesty's opposition was in theory at least, any more or less the games friends than the other. But the absence of a simple two party system meant that her Majesty's opposition was not the alternative government that

it is now. When the government felt the opposition might not be prepared to take its place though the four successive parliament elected from 1841 began under one sort of Cabinet and ended under another, indicating the degree to which the connection between elections and Cabinet was broken by the inter position of the house of commons.

With the development of a strong and a disciplined two party system after the second reforms act. "Her Majesty's opposition became the alternative governments", but normally unable to displace the government during the life of a parliament. In these respects it may be argued that the growth of the mass party has greatly increased the rigidity of party relationships in the House of Commons. Two great monolithic structures now face each other and advance to furious arguments about the comparatively minor issues that separate them.

Parliamentary system requires that members of parliament, and, therefore parliamentary parties also, must hold themselves responsible solely to the electorate and not to the mass organization of their supporters outside parliament. Therefore its appeal must be to the electorates and from the late 1860s the party leaders turned to base their campaign
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appeals on one or two issues. A generation later—these were becoming programmes. The party contest of British representative democracy took form an essential elements of which is official opposition. The Phrase "His Majesty's Loyal opposition," first used in 1826 derisively, came to express acceptance of the party system, which was provided by the crown act for the payment of a salary from public funds to the leader of the opposition in British Parliament.

Now comes the French party system, which is unique in having a large number of loosely organized parties. But it had two characteristics. First having loosely organized parties, France has very disciplined parties, second, these parties are both extremely volatile and extremely insistent. They split and break with considerable ease and eagerness, but the political bent and not the ideology—i.e. thoughts and programmes characterise each of them is sufficiently permanent to lead eventually to reunions-rearrangements or simply brotherly coexistence.

Therefore, in order to attempt the analysis of this strange mixture of organization of all kinds, history geography,

sociology and psychology, all have to be taken into account. The ever changing and complex history of France may explain that by up to recently, a section of population did not accept revolution, while the others are extremely revolutionaries. Right, left, the anti-revolutionary right and the revolutionary left and other forms of left and right are geographically located in the areas of deep religious practice. Further social changes between workers and employees, rural and urban dwellers and probably psychological traits as well as individualism of many French men have to be taken into account. 38

Modern organised political parties were not formed, inform until the beginning of the twentieth century and organised disciplined parties are of recent origin. There was a time when liberal French democracy refused to recognize the existence of parties for no intermediaries could be allowed between deputies. Crops of intermediaries either it may be province, social class, professional groups of political parties are opposed as a menace to national sovereignty, which was necessarily individual and was the outcome of Rousseau's ideas, and of the individualism of nineteenth century. Every thing was condemned, which tended to fragment the sovereign notion which prevailed many years, because the
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groups in 1871-75 in National Assembly were called reunions and forbidden to meet on the place of assembly. These 'Legitimist' were dubbed Chevaliquer. The rejection of parties in French politics was in large degree, which is clear that Hari Barrison the then president of the Chamber for the several years preceding 1913 refused to permit the mention of the term 'group' in order to preserve the independence of the judgement of peoples representatives.

But before then, French politics had developed into multi-groups or multi-factional lines, which resisted through the intermittent period of the Bonapartist and vichy government when political parties organization was eliminated and repressed, but after each of these factional and multi-party politics returned.

Two principal and opposing set of political and social ideas emerged out of the revolution era following 1789 oscillated through the nineteenth century and even into the twentieth and still linger in the attitudes of certain groups in France today. Although one of them is virtually extinct and the other much less extensively and vigorously held them formerly. Because of their long duration, both sets of ideals can be called traditions of one is authoritarian, the other is democratic Jacobin and Bonapartist.

41. Ibid., pp. 13-14.
By the turn of the century, the monarchist and Bonapartist no longer were significantly represented in parliament (although they had active and talent support in the country, and the multipurpose group nature of French politics started operating with the Republican Framework. The division among republicans had counted for less than their common opposition to the monarchist and Bonapartist before the Republic was established and while it was not yet secure, almost all, parliamentary group accepted the Republican label, the division of among the republicans themselves came to the fore.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, conservatives and liberals subdivided into at least two groups, the extremists and moderates. Among the Conservatives, these were ultras called the Legitimist after 1830, and the moderate monarchist known as Orleanist, under Louis Philippe (1820-48). Among the liberals were the militant doctrinaire Jacobins and the regular, more moderately inclined liberals. This double rift is expanded by the violence of the Revolution of 1789 and the reaction compelled by events to establish a regime. The Jacobins had to resort to terrorist tactics in order to maintain the regime, Moderate Liberals rejected these methods and refused to collaborate with them. On the other hand, the tradition of 1793 drove many socialist to
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commit acts of violence Revolution in the style of Balanque, and caused the more refined socialists to form a separate organization. But on the other hand, when the tradition of 1815 drove the political rights to repress socialism more harshly, carried out 1848 and specially later 1871 the repression of the Paris Commune naturally hardened the socialist position and strength their revolutionary tendency.

In this way, a number of factions, tendencies, and even schools of thought developed with the Revolution. They led broadly four main currents. Though the nineteenth century 'moderate' and progressive among republicans, often changed names almost from one generation to the next where in 1830, a moderate was a more Republican, the progressive called themselves 'Radical'. But Radicals grew in numbers and expanded into the centre and Progressives dissatisfied with the more timid of the 'Radicals' moved towards the 'radical socialism' and indeed 'Socialism'.

Communist came into being under the impact of Russian revolution, but naturally embodied with the leftward movement of the current of French politics. Thus we encounter at the same time, two currents of three parties (Radical, Socialist and Communist).

---
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45. Ibid., p. 81.
But two other currents, were born from the revolution, which deemed to divide the 'Right'. They came from the 'Royalist and 'Bonapartist' and created two trends, two brands. Royalist became traditional conservatives, anxious to maintain the status of notables of the Church, of the army. 'Bonapartist' were more aggressive in outlook, their nationalism was often violent if not aggressive, but their social policies more 'Left Wing', and were fascist' before the day, with a stress on authoritarian rather than dictatorial government. Viewing their past greatness, they were less determined to embark on new adventure. They provided to the disgruntled and petty-bourgeois of France, with authoritarian and semi-authoritarian movements of France whether directly or indirectly Bolenger in the 1880s or the League in the 1930, Gaullism in 1950 and 1960 even Pujadism, the Radical Right of the small shopkeepers of the mid 1950s became nationalist over Algeria and other was overseas possessions were reminiscent of 'Bonapartism' because it was linked itself, to traditions of authoritarian republicanism.

But these trends were the outcome of political, religious, socialist and economic factor, that are linked with the panorama of French life. Religion has been the issue or factor of dividing these groups. The word 'Droite' and baunch (right and left) are the two words frequently used in

the political vocabulary, means that who are anticlerical are on the 'Left' and clericals are on the 'Right'. The classical question was the main source of political conflict because the church was involved in the political struggle of the nineteenth century and opposed Republicans for long after 1892 and did not recognized the IIrd Republic. Republicanism also took every opportunity to humiliate them. They emphasis reason over faith and freedom of mind from dogma and freedom of criticism. They also wanted to subordinate any form of state agency. They thought church restraint on these freedoms and symbols of authority. Therefore they did so, by cutting some of the privilege of church which they enjoyed under the regime and by overthrowing the old regime, so that they may keep the authorities into a permanent position of subordination. Besides it, French men are Catholic and some are more Catholics, which had been critical of the revolution and heavily attached by revolutionaries was naturally allied to the 'Royalist, and later to the traditional conservatives who descended from them (but not to the Bonapartist most of whom were anti religious) a syndrome was created which associated church with 'Right' and 'Republican with anti church attitudes. Cleavages between 'Right' and 'Left' and profound religious origins and at least ostensible in 1950 and 1960 when syndrome die hard, Progressive Catholic x had the good fortunes of
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benefitting from the stigma attached the traditional conservatives by the support which they gave to the Vichy regime.
After 'Liberation the Catholic could almost have taken the allegiance of the conservative for the lack of the competition. But this was not far a long time, since 'Traditional conservatives' either preferred their lot with new Bonapartist which Gaulist successfully came to recover the lost ground soon. But a new force of 'Progressives' or 'Republicans' and acceptable catholicism had been born. Added to the 'Traditional conservatives' and the 'Bonapartist', it constitute the third force of the three main currents opposed to the three movements, which as we saw, emerged from the revolutionary groups, the Radicals, the Socialists and the Conservatives.

Social and economic factors are also linked with political life of French and effects the French politics most. The 'Conservative Liberals Conflict oscillated throughout the whole of Europe during nineteenth century took an ideological turn, and Liberal were the first in founding the complete and coherent ideology than the Conservatives which was followed by the conflict between Socialist and Capitalist. The second industrial revolution of 1815-68 produced a wealthy and powerful class which supported the aristocracy and the working class itself multiplied in size. Its confrontation helped the

spread of 'Socialism'. And in 1905 a unified socialist party was formed. The 'Republicans' were emotionally and rhetorically close to the socialist with whom they shared both 'Republicanism' and anti-clericalism, found it easier to agree on economic and social policies with the more conservative group during 'third Republic' and which included the Alliance Democratique (Founded in 1901 as a counter-weight to the Radical Party) and the Federation Republicaine (founded in 1903), first was Republicaine and anti-clerical and the second was a clerical group, attached heirarchical concepts of social organization. In 1920, the Socialist party-splited, when a party of its members decided to join the third. International Founded by the 'Russian Communist Party', and the splinter group founded the French Communist Party.

Since the Revolution France had a very large peasantry, composed of small holders duly attached to their land, and tended to live in a restricted self contained horizon, which upto 1954 had the effect of stabilising and fixing attitudes. Since the horizon of rural communities are less limited, the political allegiance tended to be rather personal within the frame work of broad trends. National party behaviour is of little concern to the small towns and village voters.

Hence the lack of party discipline, men elected in this way called themselves independent and opted for local demands in case of cross pressured between party and local demands. No party press was likely to influence them. But it did not apply to the industrial areas and large cities. These party allegiance is based on class feelings, on national party identification and on almost group behaviour. An industrial worker votes for mainly parties of the Left Employees and white collar workers for the centre and right wing Parties. But the permanance and importance of peasantry had three effects first it enabled indisciplined and sanctioned behaviour to survive much longer in France. Secondly from the communist to the extreme Right, all political groups had to accept that they were a colition either of workers and peasants or of employees and peasants, resulted in permanent tension constant misunderstanding and ideological gymnastics. Third, the interest conflict and the characteristics indiscipline worked to the advantage of the indisciplined against the disciplined, the small town have against the city Representatives, the professionals against every body. Nationalization of political attitudes were not likely to be adopted. In short parties during this time were not able to choose deputy of his own choice, and successful candidate did not obliged to adhere to his party organisation. He might go to
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the coalition widely separated from the combination while elected them and might change his party and declared himself independent and was individually irresponsible. He had personal strengths in his constituencies. There was no definite party programmes and policies of parties. Coalition ministers were the possibilities of the time, which resulted in making the government paralysed because of the contradictory party programmes, juxtaposed, and reciprocally annulled one another. Parties were a kaleidoscopic of committees, groups and movements poorly organized and badly divided even when it was a matter of defending common interest. Public opinion remained divided in roughly expressed tendencies. All this is magnified and exaggerated in local party organisation by which the parties of the third Republic had a limited influence in political life. But until 1940, the parties were a game of a complex and passionate game. Multiple intrigues crossed the corridors. Tendencies and social cliques split every group and ambition, personal interest or rancor motivated new combination almost every day. No weapon was thought mean whether it was the kind of personal scandal or procedural device.

Fifth Republic had tended to precipitate it with a modernising of France in the 1950, where peasantry had
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diminished in size and villages have become large towns. The base of indiscipline parties and factions tends gradually to shrink. Sectionalism has disappeared and national attitude prevailed and new national consciousness came into being. The decline of old stereotype, whether religious or political kind, made possible the truly great event in French political life. Means of transport and communication have brought new attitude. The invasion of the Gaulist party first on 1958 and more soon in 1962 in places where the traditional Right used to be strong and for the First time National feelings replaced sectional behaviour. Men voted a candidate simply because they were Gaulist whom they did not know and the notables of country side suffered astounding defeat where they had been assumed almost unchangeable. But this followed again infaction, division and splits with the departure of Gaulist as they had not formed a structured party.

There is another change that has occurred under the Fifth Republic is that the most disciplined party are no longer on the Left. It is the discipline of Gaulist Party that has been responsible for transforming the political life of the first twelve years of regime. The doctrinal party have tended to be preferred in the efficiency that has been the watch word of disciplined Gaulist Party.


Now the possibility of individual manoeuvre and intrigue has disappeared and the deputies deeply applied the directives of their parties. The ministers and party leaders determined the application of previously approved programmes. The deputy merely satisfied without comment, legislation agreed to by the party chief of the majority. Each group worked as a team with a well organized specialization and division of labour and each party endeavoured to keep its members informed of the work of the government and the assembly, and of the public opinion. Now the deputies of different parties seldom mixed with one another in the chamber and was treasonable to be seen speaking in the corridors with the deputies of other parties. Parliamentary atmosphere on the whole, was not conducive to negotiations and compromises. Important decisions were made not in parliament but in party head-quarters.

Besides it, the organizational changes also took a step ahead with social changes, when social changes began to emphasis the mythical quality of the concept of indivisibility of sovereignty which was supplanted by Marxist realism. Organized political action began on the extreme left and this example was followed by the Radicals, and there by the conservatives. Left frankly adopted the word party, the centre and centre Right preferred the Liberal idea and

avoid the Partisan idea and adopted the titles as alliances, federation, action, the centre right disdained the parties and association and preferred to enroll support in League. Parties of fourth republican have preferred to designate as movement, rally, or unions. 'Parti Socialist 'de Francis' of James' 'Party Socialistic Francais' of Jules Guasde' Parti Republican Radial of Radical Socialist, 'Alliance Democratique' federation Republicaine' and the Action Liberal populaire were the parties of the time of Druffs affairs.

But towards 1910 the Campaign for Proportional Representation emphasised the importance which Parties had attended as political life of the country and implies the existence of large, solidly organised parties, which was accelerated between the time of two wars as the 'Left gained influence. But the post war electoral system with proportional representation linked with blocked lists extended the importance of party organization. Party labels and party "Programmes and more rigid and disciplined multi-party structure was produced, which made difficult the coalition Cabinet to form and thus the traits of third Republic are blended by new factors introduced by the fourth Republic which has resulted in party alignment that is a blend of old and new. Thus it is noted

58. Ibid., pp. 35-50.
that French party system has been shaped by three revolutions. The political, social and religious revolution of 1789, the industrial revolution of the nineteenth's century, and the third is Russian Bolshevik revolution of 1917. The first set into motion three great issues in French politics ever since on the question of regime, the question of relation between state and church and the question of social organization, the second accelerated French economic problems and give new dimensions to the social question. The third introduced a new group, whose leaders were directed to a new and difficult set of political objectives and were susceptible tradition of French partisan claims.