A Reflection on the Dictatorship of the Majority as a Democratic Inadequacy

By

Dr. Dennis E. Igwe
Department of Philosophy
University of Uyo
denco_igwe@yahoo.com

&

Blessing N. Ike
Department of Philosophy
University of Uyo

Abstract

This paper critically examines the concept of the "dictatorship of the majority" as a democratic inadequacy, appraising how the unrestricted power of the majority can demean the foundational principles of democracy. Democracy, popularly heralded as the best form of government, is envisioned to represent the will of the people, ensuring justice for everyone in society. Regrettably, the tyranny of the majority constitutes a dent on this highly valued system of governance. The tyranny of the majority occurs when the interests or desires of the majority are imposed on the minority, disregarding their rights and needs. The paper employs analytical and critical methods to interrogate the foundational principles of democracy, such as equality, autonomy, liberty and justice, and engages the ideas of notable political thinkers, such as Tocqueville, Mill, Rousseau and Rawls, among others. The paper critically analyses the moral inadequacy of democracy that equate legitimacy solely with majority preference, underscoring how such systems risk institutionalising oppression, marginalization and injustice. The paper rebuts the assumption that majority rule always ensures fair and just outcomes. The essay highlights the risks of oppression, marginalisation, the obliteration of minority rights and the weakening of democratic institutions. Ultimately, the paper argues for a balance of majority rule with protective mechanisms that safeguard minority and individual rights to ensure justice in society. This reflection promotes a multifaceted understanding of the limitations of majority rule and sues for a more intricate view of democratic systems, one that is aligned with morality and the complexities of collective decision-making while maintaining the integrity of democratic values.

Keywords: Democracy, Majority rule, Dictatorship, Democratic Inadequacy, Justice, Right, Law.

Introduction

As a term, democracy originates from the two Greek words, "demos" (people) and "kratos" (rule or power), meaning "rule by the people". It is a political system or a system of government in which the supreme power is conferred on or vested in the people and exercised by them through their elected representatives. Among its core tenets are: rule of law, respect for human rights, political equality, popular sovereignty, separation of powers, free and fair elections, accountability and transparency, active citizen participation, plurality and tolerance and majority rule.

Democracy is often celebrated as the most morally legitimate form of political organisation, grounded in the principles of autonomy, equality, and collective self-rule. Yet, beneath its ambitious surface lies a tenacious philosophical worry, namely, that the very mechanism that enables democratic decision-making — majority rule, can serve as a tool for domination, oppression and injustice. This contradiction, often encapsulated in the phrase "the dictatorship of the majority," reveals a core inadequacy in democracy that demands rigorous philosophical scrutiny. What happens when the will of the majority, empowered by institutional legitimacy, systematically suppresses minority interests, violates human rights, or undermines moral pluralism? Is numerical superiority alone sufficient to confer justice or legitimacy?

This inquiry is basically motivated by a concern with the ethical foundations of democratic authority. While democracy promises equal moral status to all citizens, it often operates through processes that risk stifling opposition, promoting marginalisation and oppression, and perpetuating structural injustices. Philosophers such as Alexis de Tocqueville, John Stuart Mill, and more recently, Iris Marion Young and Seyla Benhabib, have cautioned against the unrestricted power of majorities. Their criticisms evoke a profound interrogation of whether democracy with its majority rule model, can live up to its normative goals without reconsidering its procedural suppositions.

This paper, therefore, aims at critically examining how the principle of majority rule, while central to democratic systems, can lead to the suppression of minority rights and interests, thereby exposing a fundamental moral flaw or limitation in democratic governance. It seeks to explore the tension between collective decision-making and individual or minority protections, and to reflect on the need for safeguards that ensure real equality, freedom and justice within democratic societies.

Normative Foundations of Democracy

Democracy is not merely a set of institutional arrangements for governance, it is fundamentally a moral ideal grounded in normative commitments to autonomy, equality, and legitimacy. These principles inform both the philosophical justification for democracy and its critical evaluation. Understanding democracy in normative terms involves examining its underlying ethical assumptions and the tensions that arise when theory confronts practice. Democracy as a moral ideal begins with the assumption that individuals possess equal moral worth and are capable of self-governance. Philosophers like Immanuel Kant laid the groundwork for this view by emphasizing the intrinsic value of autonomy — the capacity of individuals to legislate moral law for themselves. In this light, democracy is not simply a tool for aggregating preferences, but a moral framework through which individuals exercise collective self-determination (Kant 85). This normative understanding is reiterated by contemporary political theorists. For instance, Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson argue that democracy is best understood not only as a means of decision-making but also as an embodiment of moral respect among free and equal citizens (16). Deliberative democracy, in particular, reflects this ideal by emphasizing discussion and reasoning among citizens in decision-making over mere voting procedures.

The idea of autonomy in democracy pertains to the right and capacity of individuals to participate meaningfully in the governance of their political community. Democratic autonomy is both individual and collective as it affirms the individual's moral agency while facilitating a collective determination of political rules. J. S. Mill, in his defense of representative government, argues that participation in democratic processes is essential for personal and civic development (76). Thus, democracy is justified in part because it cultivates autonomy, not merely because it produces efficient outcomes.

Equality, another pillar of democracy, refers not only to equal voting rights but also to the broader notion of moral and political equality. As Anderson (44) contends, democracy enshrines the principle that no individual is inherently entitled to rule over others, thereby rejecting hierarchies of birth, wealth, or status. This egalitarian commitment challenges both aristocratic and technocratic models of governance, where authority is grounded in presumed superiority.

Legitimacy, another tenet of democracy, concerns the moral justification of political authority. In democratic theory, legitimacy arises from the consent of the governed, but more critically from the fair and inclusive processes through which that consent is expressed. According to Habermas, democratic legitimacy depends on the communicative rationality of public discourse where laws gain their authority by being the outcome of deliberation among free and equal citizens (110). Thus, legitimacy is not merely procedural but dialogical — it arises from the moral acceptability of the process.

In spite of these lofty ideals, democracy is riddled with internal tensions. A central tension lies in the conflict between majority rule and minority rights. While majority decision-making is often seen as the fairest and most effective way to resolve disagreement, it can easily become a vehicle for the oppression of dissenting voices. Tocqueville famously warned of the "tyranny of the majority," noting that numerical dominance could stifle individuality and suppress moral and intellectual diversity (245). This tension raises questions about whether majority rule is compatible with the deeper moral commitments of democracy. Another tension concerns the limits of autonomy in a complex society. While democratic theory celebrates participation, modern democracies often rely on administrative and bureaucratic structures that remove critical decisions from public debate. This results in what Robert Dahl termed "polyarchy" — a system where elite competition substitutes for genuine citizen participation (98). The challenge is to reconcile the need for expertise and efficiency with the ideal of democratic inclusion. Finally, there is the tension between procedural and substantive conceptions of democracy. Proceduralists argue that as long as fair rules are followed, the outcomes are democratically legitimate. However, critics like Iris Marion Young contend that democracy must also be evaluated by its substantive outcomes, particularly in terms of justice and inclusion (23). For democracy to be morally adequate, it must not only follow fair procedures but also avoid perpetuating structural inequalities.

Conceptual and Historical Perspectives to Majority Rule

Majority rule, often taken as a given in democratic discourse, has a complex and evolving philosophical lineage. Its normative legitimacy has been both defended and critiqued by political theorists throughout history. To understand its present form and discontents, it is essential to trace its genealogy in political philosophy, explore its foundations in Enlightenment thought and liberal theory, and analyze the justifications — both instrumental and intrinsic — that have been employed in its defense. The idea that political decisions should be guided by the will of the majority can be traced back to ancient democratic experiments, notably in Athens, where direct participation of citizens formed the core of the political process. However, even in these early models, the principle of majority rule was not always consistently applied or normatively justified.

It was largely a practical method for decision-making rather than a deeply theorized ethical principle. In the medieval and early modern periods, political authority was predominantly justified through divine right or hereditary privilege. The shift toward majority rule emerged with the advent of modern contractualist thought. Thomas Hobbes, while not a democrat, introduced the idea of political authority emerging from collective consent, even if it was ultimately vested in a sovereign power (109). John Locke extended this line of thinking by arguing for government as a trust, established by the consent of the governed, which implied a need for some mechanism — like majority rule — to resolve disagreements (330).

The Enlightenment brought a profound transformation in the conceptualization of political legitimacy. Thinkers such as Rousseau and Kant emphasized autonomy, rationality, and freedom as the cornerstones of political life. Rousseau, in particular, offered a complex relationship to majority rule. In *The Social Contract*, he advocated for the "general will" as the authentic expression of the collective good, which the majority might approximate—but not necessarily represent in every case. Rousseau warned against factionalism and the "will of all," which could deviate from justice, even if numerically supported (64). The liberal tradition, especially in the Anglo-American context, embraced majority rule more explicitly, albeit with crucial qualifications. John Stuart Mill, writing in *On Liberty*, recognized the utility of majority rule but cautioned against its potential to become a "social tyranny" more formidable than governmental oppression (9). Mill's concerns prefigure the modern critique of majoritarianism as oppressive when untempered by liberal principles such as individual rights, rule of law, and freedom of expression.

The legitimacy of majority rule has been defended on both instrumental and intrinsic grounds. Instrumentally, majority rule is seen as the most efficient and fair method of aggregating preferences in a way that minimizes conflict and ensures stability. This view aligns with utilitarian or pragmatic conceptions of democracy. For instance, Benthamite utilitarianism can be interpreted to support majority rule as a means of maximizing overall happiness, assuming that the majority's preferences reflect the greater good. In contrast, intrinsic justifications treat majority rule as a moral principle in its own right. Here, the emphasis lies on equality: in a democracy where each person has equal moral worth, each should have an equal say in decision-making, and majority rule reflects this symmetry. This perspective is affirmed in the work of contemporary democratic theorists like Robert Dahl who regards majority rule as the only decision-making rule compatible with political equality (37). However, this intrinsic justification often collides with the ethical need to protect minorities, leading to the well-known tension between democracy and justice. Philosophers such as Joshua Cohen have attempted to reconcile this by embedding majority rule within deliberative processes that aim to respect pluralism and foster mutual justification (29). In such models, majority decisions are legitimate not merely because they represent more votes, but because they emerge from fair deliberation among equals.

Dictatorship of the Majority: A Critical Look

The concept of the "dictatorship of the majority" captures one of the central paradoxes in democratic theory: the possibility that a system designed to ensure equal participation and self-rule may, in practice, devolve into a form of moral and political domination. This phrase, popularized by Alexis de Tocqueville in *Democracy in America*, describes a condition in which the majority, through the machinery of democracy, imposes its will so completely that it negates the freedom and moral autonomy of minorities. For Tocqueville, the danger lay not merely in the physical power of the majority, but in its psychological and moral influence — its ability to define social norms, determine truth, and shape the boundaries of the permissible (245). Tocqueville's

insight remains philosophically resonant because it underscores a structural vulnerability within democracy itself. In a system that privileges majority rule as the primary mechanism of legitimacy, the boundaries between democratic decision-making and tyranny become disturbingly porous. The majority may not only override minority preferences but also marginalize their identities, suppress dissent, and normalize epistemic injustices.

As John Stuart Mill argued, democracy's legitimacy must rest on more than numerical authority; it requires a robust culture of liberty, especially the liberty of thought and expression (63). Mill's warning is especially relevant in contexts where democratic institutions are present but pluralism is weak. In such systems, the majority often assumes a position of moral infallibility, equating its preferences with the public good. This moral homogenization undermines the pluralist foundations of democracy, reducing it to a procedural mechanism for aggregating preferences rather than a forum for reasoned deliberation. As Iris Marion Young contends, this procedural view excludes "differentiated modes of expression" and privileges dominant cultural norms as if they were neutral (59). Consequently, those outside the dominant majority — whether due to race, religion, gender, or ideology — experience systemic marginalization even within formally democratic frameworks.

Philosophically, the "dictatorship of the majority" invites a critique of democracy that is not anti-democratic but rather post-majoritarian. It demands a deeper interrogation of how legitimacy is constructed. Rousseau, despite his emphasis on the "general will," acknowledged that the majority's will is only legitimate if it is oriented toward justice, not merely toward consensus (54). Without moral constraints, majority rule can become indistinguishable from collective despotism. Furthermore, the majority's capacity to define "the normal" introduces an epistemic dimension to its dominance. As Miranda Fricker has shown in her work on epistemic injustice, those in power often control whose knowledge is deemed credible, whose experiences are recognized, and whose voices are heard (1). A democracy governed by majority rule without epistemic humility risks silencing the very perspectives that might challenge injustice and promote deeper understanding.

To critique the "dictatorship of the majority" is not to reject democracy, but to call for a conception of democracy that is inclusive, dialogical, and morally reflective. Deliberative democrats like Jürgen Habermas advocate for discursive practices that treat participants as moral equals, privileging reason over mere aggregation (107). Similarly, Chantal Mouffe's notion of "agonistic pluralism" emphasizes the necessity of ongoing contestation and dissent within democratic life (20). These frameworks seek to preserve the democratic ideal while acknowledging the dangers inherent in its dominant proceduralist articulations. The concept of the "dictatorship of the majority" remains a crucial philosophical lens through which to evaluate the moral coherence of democratic systems. It highlights the need for democracy to be more than a game of numbers; it must be a commitment to justice, inclusion, and the dignity of all persons, regardless of their numerical strength.

Moral Limits of Democracy

Although democracy is normatively premised on such values as autonomy, equality and collective self-determination, it is not morally absolute. It is bounded by ethical limitations that arise from the basic rights and dignity of individuals, particularly those who find themselves in the minority. The assumption that democratic tenets, particularly, majority rule, can yield legitimate and just outcomes in all cases, overlooks the potential for democracy to become morally self-defeating when it ceases to protect the very individuals whose autonomy it purports to uphold. At the core of democratic legitimacy lies the principle of political equality. Each individual is presumed to have an equal say in collective decision-making. However, as John Rawls argues, the fairness of political processes must be evaluated not merely by procedural inclusion, but also by the justice

of their outcomes. In his theory of "justice as fairness," Rawls insists that a just society must be structured so that it guarantees equal basic liberties for all, even if the majority supports policies that would infringe upon them (53). This foundational obligation imposes a moral limit on democratic authority, namely, the will of the majority cannot justly override the basic rights of individuals.

In a majoritarian democracy, power is exercised by lobbyists, interest groups, dictatorial majority rulers other than the people of which the minority are among. According to Dahl, democracy must be more than majority rule; it must incorporate norms of deliberation, inclusivity and respect for dissent. Dahl argues that "polyarchal" democracy must involve institutions that protect minority interests through mechanisms such as judicial review, constitutional safeguards, and civil liberties (91). The absence of this, can lead to a dictatorship in decision makings.

Democracy which is often acknowledged as the most just and participatory system of government, is not without its flaws. While it provides citizens with a voice in decision making and safeguards individual freedoms, it also presents significant inadequacies. These challenges range from inefficiency and corruption, to the tyranny of the majority which is a significant problem of democracy where the majority's interest override that of the minority. For Jeremy Waldon, the legitimacy of democratic decisions arises not merely from participations, but from the assurance that the process respects the equal status of all participants and does not treat anyone merely as a means (112). This implies making empty promises that are not kept, which includes using men as there means to an end. Addressing this challenges, requires to incorporate institutional reforms, and practices and stronger democratic norms.

Reconciling Democracy and Justice

Reconciling democracy and justice entails embracing the fundamental tenets of democracy which involves equal participation and the recognition and protection of fundamental human right and taking into cognizance fair procedures in a democratic system to tackling unfair treatment in a democratic setting.

On reconciling democracy and justice, the first philosophical method to use is social justice, as can be seen in Rawls principle of justice. For Rawls, a just society is one in which the "basic structure" guarantees equal liberty and fair equality of opportunity, regardless of majority preference (53).

Rawls' theory upholds equality which is among the basic principles of democracy. Equality is the condition of being same or equivalent in value. "It relates to the right of people to be treated fairly and of different groups to be accorded similar or same treatment … without prejudice to race, gender, ethnicity, religion, and political affiliation" (Igwe, "Basic Social and Political Concepts" 19). Rawls' theory also upholds social justice which is concerned with fair treatment of every person in the society. Justice is a concept that humans value "owing to its propensity to ensure man's fulfillment and the realization of a peaceful harmonious state or society" (Igwe, *Philosophy: Origin, Development and Relevance* 97). Social justice is a variant of justice. "As a variant of justice, it upholds equal rights, opportunities and obligations for all persons without prejudice to race, colour, gender, religion, political leaning, culture, age or economic status" (Igwe, "Basic Social and Political Concepts" 20). This implies the fair and equal treatment of all without conditions. Rawls in his theory, argues that a just society must be structured so that it guarantees equal basic liberties for all, including the minorities. This implies that the decisions of the majority cannot justly subdue the rights of the minorities, including individual rights.

Democratic procedures, this work argues, must be reconciled with the demands of justice, especially in a multilingual, pluralistic and multi-religious society. In Young's view, "a democracy that fails to incorporate the voices and experiences of those on the margins cannot claim to be just (119). Justice here entails equal participation of all, and anything outside this, is injustice. Habermas echoes similar view, as he sues for a communicative model of legitimacy where laws are just only if they arise from processes of public reasoning among free and equal citizens (110). This highlights public deliberation that is open for debates which allow for citizens to speak their minds concerning matters that affects them.

Democracy and justice can be reconciled through the promotion of and dedication to the core principles of democracy which include the rule of law, accountability, respect for the fundamental human rights, equal participation, an independent judiciary, independent electoral body, transparency, periodic election, equality and social justice, separation of power and free and fair election. If these core tenets of democracy are truly upheld and practiced in a democracy, the tyranny of the majority would be mitigated, alienation of the minority would also be undermined. Alienation holds in democratic systems as man (the minority) is alienated from his fellow man (the majority) similar to the alienation of the worker from the capitalist in Marx's analysis of capitalism (Igwe, *Karl Marx: Ideas, Life & Lessons* 203).

No doubt, democracy upholds majority rule, it however, must ensure that minority rights are not neglected but protected. The majority rule should not affect the rights and privileges of the ordinary people. Everyone has natural rights, regardless of their status. "These are rights not dependent on the laws or customs of any particular culture or government, and thus, universal, inviolable, imprescriptible, and inalienable" (Igwe, *Natural Rights as Nonsense Upon Stilts* 380). In a pluralistic society, civil education should be strongly upheld and undertaken to ensure respect for rights, tolerance and mutual understanding among the people to end segregation, marginalisation, tribalism, racism, alienation and biased treatments.

Reimagining Democratic Adequacy

In an era marked by rapid technological change, deepening inequality, racism, injustice and growing political polarization, the foundational assumptions of democracy become questionable. The adequacy of democracy, therefore, resurfaces as a significant concept in our contemporary world. To reimagine democratic adequacy is not merely to overhaul or fix defective systems, but to rethink what democracy should mean and how it might better serve diverse, interconnected societies in our contemporary era.

The concept of democratic adequacy entails the capacity of democratic institutions and processes to accomplish their envisioned purpose or functions justly and effectively. It involves evaluating a system of government if it is truly dedicated to the core tenets of democracy which include, accountability, freedom and human rights, equality and social justice, free and fair elections, transparency etc. Democratic adequacy also has to do with what makes a political system democratic, what the key democratic ideals are, and what it means to be democratically legitimate.

Democratic adequacy is not only concerned with reconciling majority rule with minority rights or with ensuring an independent electoral body for free and fair elections, but also with understanding the philosophical grounds for which democracy holds. Democracy should not only be concerned with the majorities as influenced by the utilitarian philosophy, ignoring the minorities which are integral part of democratic systems. According to Mouffe, democracy must "make room for dissent and antagonism as constitute features of the political" (103). This implies that democratic

adequacy makes room for people to disagree, protest and engage in debates where they voice out their feelings towards the government and hold the system accountable for marginalisation, discrimination or injustice. Democratic adequacy, thus, is not only concerned with the government, the economy, the policies, but also with the peoples' participation and engagement in political matters.

Conclusion

Dictatorship of the majority is a democratic inadequacy which undermines the reliability of democracy as a strong political system. This paper has attempted to trace how the "majority rule", while basic to democratic decision-making, becomes morally and politically problematic when considered in terms of absolute standard of legitimacy. In consideration of the ideas of notable political thinkers, such as Tocqueville, Mill, Rousseau, Rawls, and Young, among others, it is noted that unrestricted authority of majorities can result in the silencing of minority voices, violation of individual rights, erosion of individual autonomy, and the establishment of systemic injustices. The main philosophical problem identified here is that when democracy is reduced to mere summation of preferences, it neglects its own normative values and commitments. If democracy is to be justified with regards to values such as justice, equality, and moral plurality, then the authority of the majority must be restricted by ethical principles and institutional safeguards. This work contends that without such restrictions, democratic systems risk devolving into legitimized forms of moral marginalisation, oppression and epistemic arrogance and autocracy. The paper proposes a normative reconsideration of democratic structures. It highlights the need for constitutional mechanisms that restrain the over dominance of the majority, such as, judicial review and minority rights protection. It further advocates a moral reformulation of democratic legitimacy – one that accentuates the dignity and agency of all persons, not merely the numerical majority.

Works Cited

Ahoyo, Nestor, Felix. *Philosophic explorations*. Ibadan: Hope publications Ltd, 2012.

Anderson, Elizabeth. *The Imperative of Integration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Cohen, Joshua. "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy." *The Good Polity: Normative Analysis of the State.* Edited by Alan Hamlin and Philip Pettit.London: Blackwell, 1989, pp. 17–34.

Dahl, Robert A. *Democracy and Its Critics*. Yale: Yale University Press, 1989.

Fricker, Miranda. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Gutmann, Amy, and Dennis Thompson. *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Habermas, Jurgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Translated by William Rehg. London: MIT Press, 1996.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Igwe, Dennis E. "Basic Social and Political Concepts". *Introductory Discourse on Sociopolitical Philosophy*. Nwankwor, Iks J. and Igwe, Dennis E. Anambra: BL Excel Prints, 2024.

Igwe, Dennis E. *Philosophy: Origin, Development & Relevance*. Abuja: BricksCom Publishers, 2022.

Igwe, Dennis E. *Karl Marx: Ideas, Life & Lessons*. Abuja: Estonia Media, 2022.

Igwe, Dennis E. "Natural Rights as 'Nonsense Upon Stilts': Assessing Bentham". *International Journal of Arts and Sciences.* Vol. 8. No. 3.

John, Elijah Okon. Man and the State: *Issues in socio-political philosophy*. Lagos: Omega Books, 2016.

Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by Mary Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1998.

Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited by Peter Laslett, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Mill, John Stuart. *Considerations on Representative Government*. London: Prometheus Books, 1991.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. Edited by Elizabeth Rapaport.London: Hackett Publishing, 1978.

Mouffe, Chantal. *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso, 2000.

Rawls, John.*A Theory of Justice*. Revised ed., Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Rawls, John. *Political Liberalism*. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*. Translated by Maurice Cranston.London: Penguin Books, 1968.

Taylor, Charles. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Waldron, Jeremy. *Law and Disagreement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Young, Iris Marion. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.