

**Presidential and Parliamentary Systems
in Government : Recent trends in World Democracies**



Project Report of T.Rajavardhan
(II Year B.B.A, LLB(Hons), National Law University, Jodhpur)

Submitted to Lok Satta in June 2004

Contents

Title	Page No
<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>Democracies</u>	7
<u>Parliamentary Democracies and their Population</u>	9
<u>Presidential Democracies and their Population</u>	11
<u>Recently Presidentialised Countries</u>	13
<u>A Suggestion for Indian Scenario</u>	19
<u>Conclusion</u>	20
<u>References</u>	21

Acknowledgement

This work is submitted to Lok Satta as a part of my internship. I am grateful to all those who helped directly and indirectly in the completion of this project on Parliamentary and Presidential Democracies. I feel it as my duty to thank Mr.Sanjay who has helped and guided me during the course of my work. I am also thankful to Dr.Jayaprakash Narayan for giving me this opportunity. I also thank Mr.Sivarma Krishna for his helping hand and also other members of the Lok Satta family who played an invisible part in my successful completion of this work

Introduction

For most of its history, democracy has been regarded as among the most undesirable forms of government. For Aristotle, who defined it as “rule with a view to the advantage of those who are poor,” democracy was a “deviation” from the superior form of government he termed polity, a mixed regime that included oligarchic elements. For Plato, democracy was characterized by total license; it naturally degenerated into tyranny. And even for the American “Founding Father” James Madison, democracy—understood as direct popular rule—was a dangerous form of government posing serious threats to both individual rights and collective well-being. By the start of the twenty-first century, however, it seems that the conventional wisdom about democracy has taken a 180-degree turn. Few contemporary political thinkers fail to endorse democracy as the best—or at least the best possible—form of rule.

Democracy can be defined as: “*Government by popular representation; a form of government in which the supreme power is retained by the people, but is indirectly exercised through a system of representation and delegated authority periodically renewed; a constitutional representative government; a republic.*”¹

The two major forms of governments that the countries are adopting in the world are:

1. Parliamentary
2. Presidential

These two systems differ from each other in areas like head of the state, head of the government, separation of executive and legislature etc.

*A **parliamentary system**, or **parliamentarism**, is a multi-party form of government in which the executive is formally dependent on the legislature. Hence, there is no clear-cut separation between the legislative and executive branches of government.*²

The executive is typically called the cabinet, and headed by a prime minister or premier who is considered the head of government. In most parliamentary systems the prime minister and the members of the cabinet are also members of the legislature. The leader of the leading party in the parliament is often appointed as the prime minister. In many countries, the cabinet or single members thereof can be removed by the parliament through a vote of no confidence. In addition, the executive often can dissolve the parliament and call for a fresh election.

Under the parliamentary system the roles of head of state and head of government are more or less separated. In most parliamentary systems, the head of state is primarily a ceremonial position, often a monarch or president, retaining duties without much political relevance, such as civil service appointments. In many (but not all) parliamentary systems, the head of state may have reserve powers, which are usable in a crisis. In most cases however, such powers are either by convention or by constitutional rule only exercised upon the advice and approval of the head of government.

The Westminster System is a particular type of parliamentary system that developed out of parliamentary democracy as practiced at Westminster in London and was promulgated

¹ <http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/democracy>

² A.G. Noorani, *The Presidential System: Indian Debate*, (New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1989), pg 12.

as the dominant form of government throughout the British Empire, many of whose colonies, since gaining their independence, have become Commonwealth countries. In this model the head of state has considerable reserve powers, which have been limited in practice by convention rather than explicit constitutional rule.

Origin of Parliamentary System:

The origins of the modern concept of prime ministerial government go back to the Kingdom of Great Britain (1707 - 1800). In theory, power resided in the monarch, who chaired cabinet. King George I's inability to speak English led the responsibility for chairing cabinet to go to the leading minister, literally the *prime* or first minister. The gradual democratisation of parliament with the broadening of the voting franchise increased parliament's role in controlling government, and in deciding who the king could ask to form a government. By the nineteenth century, the Great Reform Act of 1832 led to parliamentary dominance, with its choice *invariably* deciding who were prime minister and the complexion of the government.

Other countries gradually adopted what came to be called the Westminster Model of government, with an executive answerable to parliament, but exercising powers nominally vested in the head of state, in the name of the head of state. Hence the use of phrases like *Her Majesty's government* or *His Excellency's government*. Such a system became particularly prevalent in older British dominions, many of which had their constitutions enacted by the British parliament. Examples include Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the Irish Free State and the Union of South Africa, though these parliaments themselves have often evolved or were reformed from their British model: the Australian Senate, for instance, more closely reflects the US Senate than the British House of Lords; whereas there is no upper house in New Zealand.

*A **presidential system** is a system of government that features a president as the nation's head of state and active chief executive authority. It is often associated with the congressional system of government. The term is usually used in contrast to cabinet government, which is usually a feature of the parliamentary system.*³

In a presidential system, the central principle is that the legislative and executive branches of government should be separate. This leads to the separate election by the electorate or an electoral college of the president, who is elected to office for a fixed term of office, and only removable in extreme cases for gross misdemeanour by impeachment and dismissal. In addition he or she does not need to choose cabinet members from or commanding the support of, a legislative majority.

As with the President's set term of office, the legislature also exists for a set term of office and cannot be dissolved ahead of schedule. In a presidential system, the president usually has special privileges in the enactment of legislation, namely the possession of a power of veto over legislation of bills, in some cases subject to the power of the legislature by weighed majority to override the veto. However, it is extremely rare for the president to have the power to directly propose laws, or cast a vote on legislation. The legislature and the president are thus expected to serve as a check on each other's powers.

³ *Ibid*

France swung between different styles of **presidential**, **semi-presidential** and **parliamentary** systems of government; parliamentary systems under Louis XVIII, Charles X, the July Monarchy under Louis Philippe, King of the French and the Third Republic and Fourth Republic, though the extent of full parliamentary control differed in each, from one extreme under Charles X (a strong head of state) to full parliamentary control (under the Third Republic). Napoleon III offered attempts at some degree of parliamentary control of the executive, though few regarded his regime as genuinely parliamentary and democratic. A presidential system existed under the short-lived Second Republic. The modern Fifth Republic system combines aspects of presidentialism and parliamentarianism.

Parliamentary System	Presidential System
Usually the culmination of a process from monarchy to assembly challenging monarchy's hegemony to assembly taking over responsibility for government. A political system in which the executive, once separate, has been challenged by the assembly that is then transformed into a parliament comprising both government and assembly.	There was no "natural evolution" as in the case of parliamentary development. Instead, the Founding Fathers made the assembly a distinct part of government as part of the separation of powers.
There is now a prime minister or chancellor who is the head of government and a monarch or president who is the head of state.	President elected "by the people", for a definite term of office. While running at the same time as assembly elections, it is also a separate election.
The Head of State Appoints the Head of Government.	President is both head of state and head of government.
The Head of Government Appoints the Ministry. These appointments can be personal choices or the outcome of bargaining to form coalition government.	The President Appoints Heads of Departments Who are His Subordinates.
The Ministry (or Government) is a Collective Body. The Prime Minister is really just the first among equals.	Although the heads of executive departments are collectively called the Cabinet it is not a Cabinet in the parliamentary sense of the term. The government is really the president's government.
The Ministers remain representatives of their districts even after they are appointed to Ministerial positions in most systems. They are thus accountable to both a government and a constituency.	It is customary in presidential systems that the members of government cannot be part of the assembly.
By withholding support the parliament may be able to force the government to resign and cause the head of state to appoint a	Presidents must follow constitutional prescriptions.

new government.	
The Head of Government May Advise the Head of State to Dissolve the Parliament.	The President Cannot Dissolve or Coerce the Assembly.
Parliament as a Whole is Supreme Over Its Constituent Parts, Government and Assembly, Neither of Which May Dominate the Other. Government depends on the support of the parliament but it may also dissolve it. Therefore, neither dominates.	The Assembly is Ultimately Supreme Over the Other Branches of Government and There is No Fusion of the Executive and Legislative Branches as in a Parliament. With the notion of separation of power, neither is ideally supreme but the assembly generally has more options (including to impeach a President) than the President has.
Government is not directly elected but chosen from those elected representative comprising the parliament. During the elections, the Ministers stand as representatives of their district, not the government.	The Executive is Directly Responsible to the Electorate. The president is elected with popular votes and is one of, if not the only, person elected by the entire body of electors.
Parliament is the Focus of Power in the Political System. The fusion of the executive and legislative powers in parliament is responsible for the overriding ascendancy of parliament. "It is the stage on which the drama of politics is played out; it is the forum for the nation's ideas; and it is the school where future political leaders are trained".	There is No Focus of Power in the Political System. Instead of concentration there is division; instead of unity, fragmentation.

In **reality**, elements of both systems overlap. Though a president in a presidential system does not have to choose a government, answerable to the legislature; the legislature may have the right to scrutinise his or her appointments to high governmental office, with the right, on some occasions, to block an appointment. In the *United States*, many appointments must be confirmed by the Senate. By contrast, though answerable *to* parliament, a parliamentary system's cabinet may be able to make use of the parliamentary 'whip' (an obligation on party members in parliament to vote with their party) to control and dominate parliament, reducing its ability to control the government. Presidential governments make no distinction between the positions of Head of state and Head of government, both of which are held by the president. Most parliamentary governments have a symbolic Head of State in the form of a president or monarch. That person is responsible for the formalities of state functions as the figurehead while the constitutional prerogatives as Head of Government are generally exercised by the Prime Minister. Presidents in presidential systems are always active participants in the political process, though the extent of their relative power or powerlessness may be influenced by the political makeup of the legislature and whether their supporters or opponents have the dominant position therein. In some presidential systems such as *South Korea* or the

Republic of China (on Taiwan), there is an office of the prime minister or premier, but unlike semi-presidential or parliamentary systems, the premier is responsible to the president rather than to the legislature.

In every government there are three **sorts of power: the legislative, the executive and the judiciary**. In a parliamentary form of government the legislature and the executive are not separated but in a presidential form of government there is clear separation. No political truth is certainly of greater intrinsic value, or is stamped with the authority of more enlightened patrons of liberty, than that on which the objection is founded. The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny. This is because the power of enacting the laws and implementing them both lie in the hands of the same person. Were the federal Constitution, therefore, really chargeable with the accumulation of power, or with a mixture of powers, having a dangerous tendency to such an accumulation, no further arguments would be necessary to inspire a universal reprobation of the system. I persuade myself, however, that it will be made apparent to every one that the charge cannot be supported, and that the maxim on which it relies has been totally misconceived and misapplied. In order to form correct ideas on this important subject, it will be proper to investigate the sense in which the preservation of liberty requires that the three great departments of power should be separate and distinct. Montesquie who ran away from tyrannical rule of the French monarch mistook English system of administration to be the ideal one free from tyranny by separating the three organs of power. However the idea of Separation can be attributed to Montesquie though he put forth the idea after misreading the British administration.

There is no word that admits of more various significations, and has made more varied impressions on the human mind, than that of **liberty**.

Some have taken it as a means of deposing a person on whom they had conferred a tyrannical authority; others for the power of choosing a superior whom they are obliged to obey; others for the right of bearing arms, and of being thereby enabled to use violence; others, in fine, for the privilege of being governed by a native of their own country, or by their own laws. A certain nation for a long time thought liberty consisted in the privilege of wearing a long beard. Some have annexed this name to one form of government exclusive of others: those who had a republican taste applied it to this species of polity; those who liked a monarchical state gave it to monarchy. Thus they have all applied the name of liberty to the government most suitable to their own customs and inclinations: and as in republics the people have not so constant and so present a view of the causes of their misery, and as the magistrates seem to act only in conformity to the laws, hence liberty is generally said to reside in republics, and to be banished from monarchies. In fine, as in democracies the people seem to act almost as they please, this sort of government has been deemed the most free, and the power of the people has been confounded with their liberty. It is true that in democracies the people seem to act as they please; but political liberty does not consist in an unlimited freedom. In governments, that is, in societies directed by laws, liberty can consist only in the power of doing what we ought to will, and in not being constrained to do what we

ought not to will. We must have continually present to our minds the difference between independence and liberty. Liberty is a right of doing whatever the laws permit, and if a citizen could do what they forbid he would be no longer possessed of liberty, because all his fellow-citizens would have the same power.

Although Montesquieu separated governmental functions and separated governmental powers, there is no clear one-to-one correspondence between the two because he did not insist on an absolute separation. Thus, although the executive is a separate branch, it properly partakes (through the veto, for example) in a legislative function. This blending or overlapping of functions is in part necessitated by Montesquieu's intention that separation checks the excesses of one or the other branch. Separation of powers here reinforces or even merges into balanced government. Excesses may come from all or almost all sides. The nobility mediate between a potentially overbearing lower house and the executive. The executive's power to convene and prorogue the legislature and to veto its enactments are forms of self-defence, while the legislature's power to impeach and try the agents or ministers of the executive is necessary and sufficient to hold the executive accountable to examination without holding him hostage.

So absolute separation is not possible and all the three organs especially the executive and the legislature have to work in coordination with each other. Otherwise the result would be deadlock of governmental affairs. In a parliamentary form of government there is no separation of powers but this is possible in a presidential form of government. Over the period of time the presidential systems have proved to be more stable than the parliamentary form of government. There many failures of the presidential system in parts like South America and Africa where these countries took certain measures to establish a more stable government. In the past decade or so many countries of these two continents have made major amendments or even adopted a new constitution altogether to have a stable government.

The other problem the parliamentary form of government are facing is, if no single party commands absolute majority and a government is formed by alliances, then it leads to chaos because the head of the government has to bow down to many pressures from his allies. He is forced to abide by regional interests rather than national interests. Altogether this hampers the overall progress of the country. There are drawbacks even in presidential system of government but they are comparatively less. This is the reason why most of the democracies in the world today are looking forward for presidential system of government. With presidential system of government some Latin American and African countries have faced some problems like deadlock between the head of the state and the head of the government, which lead to military coups. In the past decade or so these nations have come up with major amendments in their constitutions to give more power to a directly elected president an thus paving way for presidential systems.

The other reasons for the shift towards presidentialism can be outlined as follows:

- Terrorism (Internal and External)
- Economic reforms
- Threat from neighbouring states
- Frequent elections
- Coalitions

Democracies

S.No.	Parliamentary	S.No.	Presidential-parliamentary
1	Andorra	1	Albania
2	Australia	2	Argentina
3	Austria	3	Armenia
4	Bahamas	4	Benin
5	Bangladesh	5	Bolivia
6	Barbados	6	Brazil
7	Belgium	7	Cape Verde
8	Belize	8	Chile
9	Botswana	9	Columbia
10	Bulgaria	10	Costa Rica
11	Canada	11	Cyprus
12	Czech Republic	12	Dominion Republic
13	Croatia	13	East Timor
14	Denmark	14	Ecuador
15	Dominica	15	El Salvador
16	Estonia	16	France
17	Fiji	17	Georgia
18	Finland	18	Ghana
19	Germany	19	Guatemala
20	Greece	20	Guinea-Bissau
21	Grenada	21	Honduras
22	Guyana	22	Indonesia
23	Hungary	23	Kenya
24	Italy	24	Kiribati
25	India	25	Korea, South
26	Iceland	26	Malawi
27	Ireland	27	Mali
28	Israel	28	Madagascar
29	Jamaica	29	Marshall Islands
30	Japan	30	Mexico
31	Latvia	31	Micronesia
32	Lesotho	32	Magnolia
33	Liechtenstein	33	Mozambique
34	Lithuania	34	Namibia
35	Luxemburg	35	Nauru
36	Macedonia	36	Nicaragua
37	Malta	37	Niger

38	Mauritius	38	Nigeria
39	Moldova	39	Palau
40	Monaco	40	Panama
41	Netherlands	41	Paraguay
42	New Zealand	42	Peru
43	Norway	43	Philippines
44	Papua New Guinea	44	Poland
45	St. Kitts and Nevis	45	Portugal
46	St. Lucia	46	Romania
47	St. Vincent and Grenadines	47	Russia
48	Samoa	48	Sao Tome and Principe
49	San Marino	49	Senegal
50	Slovakia	50	Seychelles
51	Slovenia	51	Sierra Lone
52	Solomon Islands	52	South Africa
53	Spain	53	Sri Lanka
54	Sweden	54	Surinam
55	Switzerland	55	Taiwan
56	Thailand	56	Turkey
57	Trinidad and Tobago	57	Ukraine
58	Tuvalu	58	US
59	U.K	59	Uruguay
60	Vanuatu	60	Venezuela
61	Yugoslavia		

Parliamentary Democracies

S.No.	Name of the Country	Population	% of Worlds Population
1	Andorra	69,150	0.00109722
2	Australia	19,731,984	0.31309131
3	Austria	8,188,207	0.12992391
4	Bahamas	297,477	0.00472013
5	Bangladesh	138,448,210	2.19678525
6	Barbados	277,264	0.0043994
7	Belgium	10,289,008	0.16325773
8	Belize	266,440	0.00422766
9	Botswana	1,573,267	0.02496334
10	Bulgaria	7,537,929	0.11960582
11	Canada	32,207,113	0.51103666
12	Czech Republic	10,249,216	0.16262635
13	Croatia	4,422,248	0.07016869
14	Denmark	5,384,384	0.08543509
15	Dominica	69,655	0.00110523
16	Estonia	1,408,556	0.02234984
17	Fiji	868,531	0.01378115
18	Finland	5,190,785	0.08236322
19	Germany	82,398,326	1.30743061
20	Greece	10,665,989	0.16923937
21	Grenada	89,258	0.00141627
22	Guyana	702,100	0.01114036
23	Hungary	10,045,407	0.15939247
24	Italy	57,998,353	0.92027139
25	India	1,049,700,118	16.6558003
26	Iceland	280,798	0.00445548
27	Ireland	3,924,140	0.06226511
28	Israel	6,116,533	0.09705224
29	Jamaica	2,695,867	0.04277586
30	Japan	127,214,499	2.01853773
31	Latvia	2,348,784	0.03726862
32	Lesotho	1,861,959	0.02954407
33	Liechtenstein	33,145	0.00052592
34	Lithuania	3,592,561	0.05700388
35	Luxemburg	454,157	0.0072062
36	Macedonia	206,312	0.00327359
37	Malta	400,420	0.00635354
38	Mauritius	1,210,447	0.0192064
39	Moldova	4,439,502	0.07044246
40	Monaco	32,130	0.00050981

41	Netherlands	216,226	0.0034309
42	New Zealand	3,951,307	0.06269617
43	Norway	4,546,123	0.07213424
44	Papua New Guinea	5,259,816	0.08345855
45	St. Kitts and Nevis	38,763	0.00061506
46	St. Lucia	1,62,157	0.00257298
47	St. Vincent and Grenadines	1,16,812	0.00185348
48	Samoa	1,78,173	0.00282711
49	San Marino	28,119	0.00044617
50	Slovakia	54,30,033	0.08615941
51	Slovenia	19,35,677	0.03071377
52	Solomon Islands	5,09,190	0.00807942
53	Spain	402,17,413	0.63813768
54	Sweden	88,78,085	0.14087034
55	Switzerland	73,18,638	0.11612628
56	Thailand	642,65,276	1.0197099
57	Trinidad and Tobago	11,04,209	0.0175207
58	Tuvalu	11,305	0.00017938
59	U.K	600,94,648	0.95353372
60	Vanuatu	1,99,414	0.00316414
61	Yugoslavia	Unavailable	Unavailable
	Total	1,817,351,613	28.8362791

Presidential Countries

S.No.	Name of the Country	Population	% of Worlds Population
1	Albania	3,582,205	0.05683956
2	Argentina	38,740,807	0.61470808
3	Armenia	3,326,448	0.05278141
4	Benin	7,041,490	0.11172872
5	Bolivia	8,586,443	0.1362428
6	Brazil	182,032,604	2.88834749
7	Cape Verde	412,137	0.00653946
8	Chile	15,665,216	0.24856309
9	Columbia	41,662,073	0.66106039
10	Costa Rica	3,896,092	0.06182007
11	Cyprus	771,657	0.01224403
12	Dominion Republic	8,715,602	0.13829219
13	East Timor	997,853	0.01583313
14	Ecuador	13,710,238	0.21754307
15	El Salvador	6,470,379	0.10266679
16	France	60,180,529	0.95489641
17	Georgia	4,934,413	0.07829531
18	Ghana	20,467,747	0.32476581
19	Guatemala	13,909,384	0.22070296
20	Guinea-Bissau	1,360,827	0.02159251
21	Honduras	6,669,789	0.10583087
22	Indonesia	234,893,453	3.72710109
23	Kenya	31,639,091	0.50202374
24	Kiribati	98,549	0.0015637
25	Korea, South	48,289,037	0.76621174
26	Malawi	1,16,513,239	1.84873871
27	Mali	11,626,219	0.18447553
28	Madagascar	16,979,744	0.26942097
29	Marshall Islands	56,429	0.00089537
30	Mexico	1,04,907,991	1.66459594
31	Micronesia	108,143	0.00171593
32	Magnolia	2,712,315	0.04303684
33	Mozambique	17,479,266	0.27734699
34	Namibia	1,927,477	0.03058366
35	Nauru	12,570	0.00019945
36	Nicaragua	5,128,517	0.0813752
37	Niger	11,058,590	0.17546884
38	Nigeria	133,881,703	2.12432758
39	Palau	19,717	0.00031285
40	Panama	2,960,784	0.04697935
41	Paraguay	6,036,900	0.09578869

42	Peru	28,409,897	0.45078548
43	Philippines	84,619,974	1.34268194
44	Poland	38,622,660	0.61283342
45	Portugal	10,102,022	0.16029079
46	Romania	22,217,839	0.35253487
47	Russia	144,526,278	2.29322717
48	Sao Tome and Principe	175,883	0.00279077
49	Senegal	10,655,774	0.16907728
50	Seychelles	80,469	0.00127682
51	Sierra Lone	5,732,681	0.09096159
52	South Africa	42,768,678	0.67861911
53	Sri Lanka	19,742,439	0.3132572
54	Surinam	435,448	0.00690934
55	Taiwan	22,603,001	0.35864631
56	Turkey	68,109,469	1.08070648
57	Ukraine	48,055,439	0.7625052
58	US	290,342,554	4.60692299
59	Uruguay	3,413,329	0.05415997
60	Venezuela	24,654,694	0.39120093
	Total	2,054,732,195	32.602844

Recently Presidentialised Countries – Reasons for doing so and the current problems faced by them

1. Albania

Between 1990 and 1992 Albania ended 46 years of xenophobic Communist rule and established a multiparty democracy. The transition has proven difficult, as corrupt governments have tried to deal with high unemployment, a dilapidated infrastructure, widespread gangsterism, and disruptive political opponents. In order to bring these deviations a constitution was adopted in 1998 to have a presidential system of government giving the president more powers.

2. Argentina

The federal state is ruled by a presidential system (Presidencia de la Nación), in which the President (Mr. Fernando De La Rúa, until 2003) is the head of both the state and the federal government. The President is elected by direct universal suffrage every four years (amendment to the Constitution, passed by Congress in 1994). The President appoints his ministers and the Chief of Staff, and is involved in all administrative issues, in addition to being politically responsible for the government. The immediate cause for the amendment to the constitution was struggle for power between the then President and Prime Minister, which left the country in shambles. However the confrontation for power subdued after a general election and the amendment was made to prevent the same thing from occurring again.

3. Armenia

Armenia and Azerbaijan began fighting over the area in 1988; the struggle escalated after both countries attained independence from the Soviet Union in 1991. By May 1994, when a cease-fire took hold, Armenian forces held not only Nagorno-Karabakh but also a significant portion of Azerbaijan proper. The economies of both sides have been hurt by their inability to make substantial progress toward a peaceful resolution. Armenia adopted a new constitution on 5th July 1995 by country wide referendum to adopt a presidential system of government to pull the country from economic backwardness.

4. Benin

Dahomey gained its independence from France in 1960; the name was changed to Benin in 1975. From 1974 to 1989, the country was a socialist state; free elections were reestablished in 1991. The country adopted a new constitution in the year 1990 to have a presidential system of elections like its neighbours.

5. Bolivia

Bolivia, named after independence fighter Simon BOLIVAR, broke away from Spanish rule in 1825; much of its subsequent history has consisted of a series of nearly 200 coups and counter-coups. Comparatively democratic civilian rule was established in the 1980s, but leaders have faced difficult problems of deep-seated poverty, social unrest, and drug production. Current goals include attracting foreign investment, strengthening the educational system, resolving disputes with coca growers over Bolivia's counter drug efforts, continuing the privatization program, and waging an anticorruption campaign by

a much stronger presidential government. The constitution of 1967 was revised in 1994 to make president more powerful.

6. Brazil

Following three centuries under the rule of Portugal, Brazil became an independent nation in 1822. By far the largest and most populous country in South America, Brazil has overcome more than half a century of military intervention in the governance of the country to pursue industrial and agricultural growth and development of the interior. Exploiting vast natural resources and a large labour pool, Brazil is today South America's leading economic power and a regional leader. The present constitution was adopted in the year 1988. Highly unequal income distribution remains a pressing problem.

Some Brazilians have advocated a parliamentary, rather than presidential, system of government, while some have even advocated restoring the monarchy as a symbol of national unity and political stability. (Brazil was briefly a parliamentary republic, similar to India and Germany, during the mid-1960s.) However, a national plebiscite was held on both issues in April 1993, but both options were rejected, and voters chose instead to remain a presidential republic.

7. East Timor

The Portuguese colony of Timor declared itself independent from Portugal on 28 November 1975 and was invaded and occupied by Indonesian forces nine days later. It was incorporated into Indonesia in July 1976 as the province of East Timor. A campaign of pacification followed over the next two decades, during which an estimated 100,000 to 250,000 individuals lost their lives. On 30 August 1999, in a UN-supervised popular referendum, the people of East Timor voted for independence from Indonesia. During 1999-2001, pro-integrationist militias - supported by Indonesia - conducted indiscriminate violence. A new constitution was adopted in the year 2001 with a presidential form of government. This was to make the executive powerful expecting violence from Indonesia and the other reason was that. On 20 May 2002, East Timor was internationally recognized as an independent state and the world's newest democracy.

8. Ecuador

The "Republic of the Equator" was one of three countries that emerged from the collapse of Gran Colombia in 1830 (the others being Colombia and Venezuela). Between 1904 and 1942, Ecuador lost territories in a series of conflicts with its neighbours. A border war with Peru that flared in 1995 was resolved in 1999. A new constitution was adopted in the year 1998 providing for a presidential system of government. One of the reasons for the conflict resolution was a stable government that had come into power as a result of the new constitution.

9. Georgia

Georgia was absorbed into the Russian Empire in the 19th century. Independent for three years (1918-1921) following the Russian revolution, it was forcibly incorporated into the USSR until the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991. Ethnic separation in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, poor governance, and Russian military bases deny the government effective control over the entirety of the state's internationally recognized territory. Despite myriad

problems, progress on market reforms and democratization support the country's goal of greater integration with Western political, economic, and security institutions. The new constitution was adopted in 1995. Georgia, with the help of the IMF and World Bank, has made substantial economic gains since 1995, achieving positive GDP growth and curtailing inflation. However, the Georgian Government suffers from limited resources due to a chronic failure to collect tax revenues. Georgia also suffers from energy shortages; it privatized the T'bilisi distribution network in 1998, but collection rates are low, making the venture unprofitable. The country is pinning its hopes for long-term growth on its role as a transit state for pipelines and trade. The start of construction on the Baku-T'bilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline and the Baku-T'bilisi-Erzurum gas pipeline will bring much-needed investment and job opportunities.

10. Ghana

Formed from the merger of the British colony of the Gold Coast and the Togo land trust territory, Ghana in 1957 became the first country in colonial Africa to gain its independence. A long series of coups resulted in the suspension of the constitution in 1981 and the banning of political parties. A new constitution, restoring multiparty politics, was approved in 1992. Lt. Jerry RAWLINGS, head of state since 1981, won presidential elections in 1992 and 1996, but was constitutionally prevented from running for a third term in 2000. He was succeeded by John Kufuor, who defeated former Vice President Atta MILLS in a free and fair election.

11. Kenya

Founding president and liberation struggle icon Jomo Kenyatta led Kenya from independence until his death in 1978, when President Daniel Toroitich arap MOI took power in a constitutional succession. The country was a de facto one-party state from 1969 until 1982 when the ruling Kenya African National Union (KANU) made itself the sole legal party in Kenya. MOI acceded to internal and external pressure for political liberalization in late 1991. The ethnically fractured opposition failed to dislodge KANU from power in elections in 1992 and 1997, which were marred by violence and fraud, but are viewed as having generally reflected the will of the Kenyan people. President MOI stepped down in December of 2002 following fair and peaceful elections. Mwai KIBAKI, running as the candidate of the multiethnic, united opposition group, the National Rainbow Coalition, defeated KANU candidate Uhuru KENYATTA and assumed the presidency following a campaign centred on an anticorruption platform. Now there is wide spread debate whether or not to empower the president with more powers like that of the US president to curb the corruption and violence. Kenya, the regional hub for trade and finance in East Africa, is hampered by corruption and reliance upon several primary goods whose prices remain low. Following strong economic growth in 1995 and 1996, Kenya's economy has stagnated, with GDP growth failing to keep up with the rate of population growth. The major problems the country is facing are widespread harvesting of small plots of marijuana; transit country for South Asian heroin destined for Europe and North America; Indian methaqualone also transits on way to South Africa; significant potential for money-laundering activity given the country's status as a regional financial center, massive corruption, and relatively high levels of narcotics-associated activities

12. Madagascar

Formerly an independent kingdom, Madagascar became a French colony in 1886, but regained its independence in 1960. During 1992-93, free presidential and National Assembly elections were held, ending 17 years of single-party rule. In 1997, in the second presidential race, Didier RATSIRAKA, the leader during the 1970s and 1980s, was returned to the presidency. The 2001 presidential election was contested between the followers of Didier RATSIRAKA and Marc RAVALOMANANA, nearly causing secession of half of the country. In April 2002, the High Constitutional Court announced RAVALOMANANA the winner.

13. Mozambique

Almost five centuries as a Portuguese colony came to a close with independence in 1975. Large-scale emigration by whites, economic dependence on South Africa, a severe drought, and a prolonged civil war hindered the country's development. The ruling party formally abandoned Marxism in 1989, and a new constitution the following year provided for multiparty elections and a free market economy. A UN-negotiated peace agreement with rebel forces ended the fighting in 1992. Heavy flooding in both 1999 and 2000 severely hurt the economy. Political stability and sound economic policies have encouraged recent change in the Constitution.

14. Namibia

South Africa occupied the German colony of South-West Africa during World War I and administered it as a mandate until after World War II, when it annexed the territory. In 1966 the Marxist South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) guerrilla group launched a war of independence for the area that was soon named Namibia, but it was not until 1988 that South Africa agreed to end its administration in accordance with a UN peace plan for the entire region. Independence came in 1990.

15. Niger

Not until 1993, 33 years after independence from France, did Niger hold its first free and open elections. A 1995 peace accord ended a five-year Tuareg insurgency in the north. Coups in 1996 and 1999 were followed by the creation of National Reconciliation Council that effected a transition to civilian rule by December 1999.

16. Nigeria

Following nearly 16 years of military rule, a new constitution was adopted in 1999, and a peaceful transition to civilian government was completed. The president faces the daunting task of rebuilding a petroleum-based economy, whose revenues have been squandered through corruption and mismanagement, and institutionalizing democracy. In addition, the OBASANJO administration must defuse longstanding ethnic and religious tensions, if it is to build a sound foundation for economic growth and political stability. Despite some irregularities the April 2003 elections marked the first civilian transfer of power in Nigeria's history.

17. Philippines

The Philippines were ceded by Spain to the US in 1898 following the Spanish-American War. They attained independence in 1946 after Japanese occupation in World War II. The 21-year rule of Ferdinand MARCOS ended in 1986, when a widespread popular rebellion forced him into exile. In 1992, the US closed its last military bases on the islands. The Philippines has had two electoral presidential transitions since the removal of MARCOS. In January 2001, the Supreme Court declared Joseph ESTRADA unable to rule in view of mass resignations from his government and administered the oath of office to Vice President Gloria MACAPAGAL-ARROYO as his constitutional successor. The government continues to struggle with Muslim insurgencies in the south.

18. Poland

Poland is an ancient nation that was conceived around the middle of the 10th century. Its golden age occurred in the 16th century. During the following century, the strengthening of the gentry and internal disorders weakened the nation, until an agreement in 1772 between Russia, Prussia, and Austria partitioned Poland. Poland regained its independence in 1918 only to be overrun by Germany and the Soviet Union in World War II. It became a Soviet satellite state following the war, but its government was comparatively tolerant and progressive. Labour turmoil in 1980 led to the formation of the independent trade union "Solidarity" that over time became a political force and by 1990 had swept parliamentary elections and the presidency. A "shock therapy" program during the early 1990s enabled the country to transform its economy into one of the most robust in Central Europe, but Poland currently suffers low GDP growth and high unemployment. Solidarity suffered a major defeat in the 2001 parliamentary elections when it failed to elect a single deputy to the lower house of Parliament, and the new leaders of the Solidarity Trade Union subsequently pledged to reduce the Trade Union's political role. Poland joined NATO in 1999 and is scheduled to accede to the European Union along with nine other states on 1 May 2004.

19. Sao Tome and Principe

Discovered and claimed by Portugal in the late 15th century, the islands' sugar-based economy gave way to coffee and cocoa in the 19th century - all grown with plantation slave labor, a form of which lingered into the 20th century. Although independence was achieved in 1975, democratic reforms were not instituted until the late 1980s. The first free elections were held in 1991 after the promulgation of the new constitution.

20. Senegal

Independent from France in 1960, Senegal joined with The Gambia to form the nominal confederation of Senegambia in 1982. However, the envisaged integration of the two countries was never carried out, and the union was dissolved in 1989. Despite peace talks, a southern separatist group sporadically has clashed with government forces since 1982. Senegal has a long history of participating in international peacekeeping.

21. South Africa

After the British seized the Cape of Good Hope area in 1806, many of the Dutch settlers (the Boers) trekked north to found their own republics. The discovery of diamonds (1867)

and gold (1886) spurred wealth and immigration and intensified the subjugation of the native inhabitants. The Boers resisted British encroachments, but were defeated in the Boer War (1899-1902). The resulting Union of South Africa operated under a policy of apartheid - the separate development of the races. The 1990s brought an end to apartheid politically and ushered in black majority rule.

22. South Korea

After World War II, a republic was set up in the southern half of the Korean Peninsula while a Communist-style government was installed in the north. During the Korean War (1950-1953), US and other UN forces intervened to defend South Korea from North Korean attacks supported by the Chinese. An armistice was signed in 1953, splitting the Peninsula along a demilitarized zone at about the 38th parallel. Thereafter, South Korea achieved rapid economic growth with per capita income rising to roughly 20 times the level of North Korea. South Korea has maintained its commitment to democratize its political processes. In June 2000, a historic first North-South summit took place between the South's President KIM Dae-jung and the North's leader KIM Chong-il.

23. Ukraine

Ukraine was the center of the first Slavic state, Kievan Rus, which during the 10th and 11th centuries was the largest and most powerful state in Europe. Weakened by internecine quarrels and Mongol invasions, Kievan Rus was incorporated into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and eventually into the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The cultural and religious legacy of Kievan Rus laid the foundation for Ukrainian nationalism through subsequent centuries. A new Ukrainian state, the Cossack Hetmanate, was established during the mid-17th century after an uprising against the Poles. Despite continuous Muscovite pressure, the Hetmanate managed to remain autonomous for well over 100 years. During the latter part of the 18th century, most Ukrainian ethnographic territory was absorbed by the Russian Empire. Following the collapse of czarist Russia in 1917, Ukraine was able to bring about a short-lived period of independence (1917-1920), but was reconquered and forced to endure a brutal Soviet rule that engineered two artificial famines (1921-22 and 1932-33) in which over 8 million died. In World War II, German and Soviet armies were responsible for some 7 to 8 million more deaths. Although independence was achieved in 1991 with the dissolution of the USSR, true freedom remains elusive, as many of the former Soviet elite remains entrenched, stalling efforts at economic reform, privatization, and civil liberties.

24. Venezuela

Venezuela was one of three countries that emerged from the collapse of Gran Colombia in 1830 (the others being Colombia and Ecuador). For most of the first half of the 20th century, Venezuela was ruled by generally benevolent military strongmen, who promoted the oil industry and allowed for some social reforms. Democratically elected governments have held sway since 1959. Current concerns include: an embattled president who is losing his once solid support among Venezuelans, a divided military, drug-related conflicts along the Colombian border, increasing internal drug consumption, over dependence on the petroleum industry with its price fluctuations, and irresponsible mining operations that are endangering the rain forest and indigenous peoples.

A suggestion for Indian sinerio:

In India founding fathers of our constitution preferred a Parliamentary form of government and adopted the same half a century ago. Except for a period of three years under Indira Gandhi's rule the citizens of India witnessed a democratic set up. One can say the parliamentary form of government in India is a success. But the recent problem that we are seeing in the past decade or so is frequent General Elections due to unstable governments. None of the regimes after the Congress government under the leadership of P.V.Narsimha Rao have lasted for the full term of five years. The debate for presidential system has surfaced then and there was serious considerations. Later the debate subdued under the NDA led government, which was more stable compared to the previous governments. Even in the 14th Lok Sabha that was elected recently there is no absolute majority to any of the political parties. This time it is the UPA under the leadership of Manmohan Singh is in power. For the past 15 years or so the people of India are witnessing governments formed by alliances with regional parties. So at the Union the governments are formed with a regional outlook and they are more concerned about the regional interests for their survival. One feels that there is less scope of national progress when the Union government is bossed over by the regional leaders. The immediate need for India is more powerful centre free from regional influences and also a government that can serve for the full term.

We cannot adopt a presidential system of government as it is because it goes against the basic structure of our Constitution. So minor changes to our parliamentary form of government shall be made to make much stronger and more reliable.

The administrative system of India can be rated as one among the best in the world for its stability. After US, UK and Mexico, India is the only fourth nation to retain the same constitution with out making any major amendments regarding administration for the survival of democracy. But it is now time to make minor amendments to have a stable government that can serve the country for the full term for which it has been elected.

The big problem, which our governments are facing nowadays, is proving their majority in the Lok Sabha. Any party in order to run the government need at least 272 Lok Sabha members. This is the minimum number, certain bills need two-thirds majority in the house and a party that has formed government with just 272+ members can pass such bills. So this is to run the minimum business in the house. The result is the governments cannot make strategic decisions. We have already seen the 13-month Vajpae government that has stepped down at the cost of one vote.

So what I suggest now is that a party to form the government should have a minimum of 272 members but when some other party moves a vote of no confidence then it up to that government to prove that the current government has no majority and the removal shall be in the like manner as that of the president. Or the other alternative would be that a joint session be convened to decide the matter and the resolution shall be voted for by at least two-thirds of the total number of members present in the house.

By this there is a chance that a government once formed can last for the full term of 5 years and also it ensures that no tyrannical laws are passed. This also solves one more problem which is haunting the ruling parties i.e. defection. The 13th Lok Sabha at the end

of its term passed laws against defection to take strict measures against the defected parliamentarians.

Conclusion

There are merits and demerits in both systems as practiced respectively by the USA and Britain. Those who follow current constitutional debates are aware of *the change the Constitution group* in USA is advocating. This group has existed for several decades but has become more vocal recently. The group finds the rigid separation of power between the Executive and Congress out-dated. They attribute to it the inefficiency, Presidential dictatorship, failure to implement policy by Cabinet who's Ministers are not people's representatives and unnecessary tensions and conflicts between Congress and Executive, especially when Congress is controlled by a different political party from that of the President. The group argues that US system of government should have already disintegrated had it not been the abundant financial resources the country has.

All this goes to say that the American system of government has vocal critics and may consist of defects which, unless removed may some day cause some dangerous stalemate. The fact, however, that the system has worked for 200 years without a military coup d'etat shows its strength and achievement of its primary aim of preventing both *tyranny* and *anarchy*. For the Ugandans who advocate such a system it would be necessary that they critically evaluate it within the American context and show how it can be profitably adapted to our local situation and mentality. The British type of Parliament system of government is also equally criticised for Parliamentary dictatorship especially where a single political party commands absolute majority, for the excessive control of cabinet by the Prime Minister and for the necessity of general election wherever the government loses a vote of *no confidence* in Parliament.

Constitutional Presidential systems of government have proved rather unsuccessful in African countries. Wherever they have been, the Executive Prime Ministers have at one time or another usurped their powers and proclaimed themselves as executive presidents. Whenever, within African countries, there have been frequent tensions and conflicts between Parliament and the Executive, the military has found it most inviting to intervene and assume power, thus silencing both organs of state. It is, therefore, with such points in mind that we should seek a system of government, which avoids the extremes of separation and cooperation and is in tune with the aspirations of the people and the demands of effective and democratic government in the developing countries. Such system should contain sufficient checks on each organ to prevent dictatorship. It should emphasise the necessary cooperation among the organs for the smooth and efficient running of government.

References

Articles:

- Constitutional Government Montesquieu, Spirit of Laws, bk_ 6, CH_ 2; BK_ 11, CHS_ 1--7, 20
- Douglas V. Verney, *Parliamentary Government and Presidential Government*, ed., Arend Lijphart.

Books:

- P.M.Bhakshi, *The Constitution of India*, (New Delhi: Universal Law Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., 2003)
- Lawrence LeDuc, Richard G. Niemi, Pippa Norris, *Comparing Democracies: Elections and Voting in Global Perspective*, (New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1996)
- A.G. Noorani, *The Presidential System: Indian Debate*, (New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1989)

Web Sites:

- <http://www.bartleby.com/151/indexes/countries/5.html>
- <http://www.nationbynation.com/Paraguay/History1.html>
- <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/tocs/v1ch10.html>
- <http://www.wealth4freedom.com>
- <http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/democracy>
- <http://www.oefre.unibe.ch/law/icl.html>
- <http://www.ukrweekly.com/Archive/2002/360204.shtml>
- <http://www.freedomhouse.com>
- <http://www.opendemocracy.com>
- <http://www.nigeriamasterweb.com/DomesticViolence.html>
- http://mi.essortment.com/presidentialpar_rket.htm
- <http://islandia.law.yale.edu/sela/lavedrae.pdf>
- <http://www.lordstutch.com/chris/stability.pdf>
- <http://www.parlcent.ca/easterneurope/brief3.pdf>

A substantial amount of material has been taken from www.bartleby.com for successfully completing the chapter on Recently Presidentialised Countries.