

## Chapter 1 : List of presidential, semi-presidential, and parliamentary countries |

*The major difference between these two systems is that in a Presidential system, the executive leader, the President, is directly voted upon by the people (Or via a body elected specifically for the purpose of electing the president, and no other purpose), and the executive leader of the Parliamentary system, the Prime Minister, is elected from.*

A presidential system separates the executive and legislative functions of the government and provides what are commonly called checks and balances to limit the power of both the chief executive and the legislature. In a parliamentary system, the legislature holds the power, and the chief executive must answer to the legislature. Another main difference is that in a presidential system, the chief executive and members of the legislature are elected separately by the people, but in a parliamentary system, the legislature is elected by the people and then must appoint or recommend for appointment one of its members to be the chief executive. Ad Many forms of government are used by countries around the world, and very few governments are completely alike, even if they use the same type of system. Presidential and parliamentary systems of government can vary in specific details from one country to another, but certain general aspects typically are the same in countries that have the same type of system. For example, in some parliamentary systems, the national legislative body is called a parliament, and in others, it might be called by a term such as "national assembly," but they generally serve the same purposes, regardless of their names. Likewise, the specific powers or duties of presidents might vary from country to country, but they generally are all elected by the people and are separate from the legislative body.

**Presidential Systems** In a presidential system, the president is the head of government and the head of state. As the head of government, he or she oversees the operations of the government and fulfills certain duties, such as appointing officials and advisers to help run the government, signing or vetoing laws passed by the legislature and establishing an annual budget.

**Parliamentary Systems** The roles of head of state and head of government often are held by different people in a parliamentary system. For example, a country might have a prime minister who acts as its head of government and a monarch who acts as its head of state. Some countries that have a parliamentary system also have a president instead of a monarch, who acts as the head of state. A country that has both a prime minister and a president is sometimes said to have a semi-presidential system of government, although it is more closely related to a parliamentary system because of the power held by the legislature and prime minister in such a system.

**Legislative Efficiency** Another difference between these systems of government is the effects that each system has on things such as efficiency and political acrimony. In a presidential system, because the chief executive and members of the legislature are elected separately, it is possible for the president to be from one political party and the legislature to be controlled by a different political party. This can cause discord at the highest levels of the government and make it difficult for the executive and the legislators to achieve their respective goals. In a parliamentary system, the prime minister is almost always from the political party that controls the legislature, so there is less discord, and it is easier for that party to accomplish its goals.

**Removing a Chief Executive** Parliamentary and presidential systems also differ in their abilities to remove the chief executive from power. In a parliamentary system, it is much easier for the legislature to remove the prime minister. Even a disagreement in policy or a lack of effective leadership could be enough reason for this to happen. A president is more difficult to remove from his or her position, and it usually is possible only in extreme cases, such as when the leader is accused of a serious crime.

**Chapter 2 : Differences between presidential and parliamentary executives? | Yahoo Answers**

*Presidential and parliamentary executives The decision to adopt either a presidential or a parliamentary executive is a critical aspect of constitutional design. 1 Considerable debate has surrounded which type is best for.*

Characteristics[ edit ] In a full-fledged presidential system, a politician is chosen directly by the people or indirectly by the winning party to be the head of government. Except for Belarus and Kazakhstan , this head of government is also the head of state , and is therefore called president. The post of prime minister also called premier may also exist in a presidential system, but unlike in semi-presidential or parliamentary systems, the prime minister answers to the president and not to the legislature. The following characteristics apply generally for the numerous presidential governments across the world: The executive can veto legislative acts and, in turn, a supermajority of lawmakers may override the veto. The veto is generally derived from the British tradition of royal assent in which an act of parliament can only be enacted with the assent of the monarch. The president has a fixed term of office. Elections are held at regular times and cannot be triggered by a vote of confidence or other parliamentary procedures, although in some countries there is an exception which provides for the removal of a president who is found to have broken a law. The executive branch is unipersonal. Members of the cabinet serve at the pleasure of the president and must carry out the policies of the executive and legislative branches. Cabinet ministers or executive departmental chiefs are not members of the legislature. A president generally can direct members of the cabinet, military, or any officer or employee of the executive branch, but cannot direct or dismiss judges. The president can often pardon or commute sentences of convicted criminals. Subnational governments of the world[ edit ] See also: State governments of the United States Subnational governments, usually states, may be structured as presidential systems. All of the state governments in the United States use the presidential system, even though this is not constitutionally required. On a local level, many cities use Council-manager government , which is equivalent to a parliamentary system, although the post of a city manager is normally a non-political position. Some countries without a presidential system at the national level use a form of this system at a subnational or local level. One example is Japan , where the national government uses the parliamentary system, but the prefectural and municipal governments have governors and mayors elected independently from local assemblies and councils.

Advantages[ edit ] This section possibly contains original research. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. December Learn how and when to remove this template message Supporters generally claim four basic advantages for presidential systems: Direct elections “ in a presidential system, the president is often elected directly by the people. However, this is not a necessary feature of a presidential system. Some presidential states have an indirectly elected head of state. Separation of powers “ a presidential system establishes the presidency and the legislature as two parallel structures. This allows each structure to monitor and check the other, preventing abuses of power. Speed and decisiveness “ A president with strong powers can usually enact changes quickly. However, the separation of powers can also slow the system down. Stability “ a president, by virtue of a fixed term, may provide more stability than a prime minister, who can be dismissed at any time. Read further Direct elections[ edit ] In most presidential systems, the president is elected by popular vote, although some such as the United States use an electoral college which is itself directly elected or some other method. That means a president can only be elected independently of the legislative branch. In a parliamentary system, the executive is drawn from the legislature, making criticism of one by the other considerably less likely. A formal condemnation of the executive by the legislature is often considered a vote of no confidence. According to supporters of the presidential system, the lack of checks and balances means that misconduct by a prime minister may never be discovered. In parliamentary systems, party discipline is much more strictly enforced. Even mild criticism from a backbencher could carry consequences serious enough in particular, removal from consideration for a cabinet post to effectively muzzle a legislator with any serious political ambitions. Despite the existence of the no confidence vote, in practice it is extremely difficult to stop a prime minister or cabinet that has made its decision. In a parliamentary system, if important

legislation proposed by the incumbent prime minister and his cabinet is "voted down" by a majority of the members of parliament then it is considered a vote of no confidence. To emphasize that particular point, a prime minister will often declare a particular legislative vote to be a matter of confidence at the first sign of reluctance on the part of legislators from his or her own party. If a government loses a parliamentary vote of confidence, then the incumbent government must then either resign or call elections to be held, a consequence few backbenchers are willing to endure. Hence, a no confidence vote in some parliamentary countries, like Britain, only occurs a few times in a century. In , David Lloyd George told a select committee: Speed and decisiveness[ edit ] Some supporters of presidential systems claim[ who? A prime minister, when taking action, needs to retain the support of the legislature, but a president is often less constrained. In Why England Slept , future U. Kennedy argued that British prime ministers Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain were constrained by the need to maintain the confidence of the Commons. Other supporters of presidential systems sometimes argue in the exact opposite direction, however, saying that presidential systems can slow decision-making to beneficial ends. Divided government, where the presidency and the legislature are controlled by different parties, is said to restrain the excesses of both the coalition and opposition, and guarantee cross-partisan input into legislation. There are some of us who think gridlock is the best thing since indoor plumbing. Gridlock is the natural gift the Framers of the Constitution gave us so that the country would not be subjected to policy swings resulting from the whimsy of the public. And the competitionâ€”whether multi-branch, multi-level, or multi-houseâ€”is important to those checks and balances and to our ongoing kind of centrist government. Thank heaven we do not have a government that nationalizes one year and privatizes next year, and so on ad infinitum. Checks and Balances, 8 Stability[ edit ] Although most parliamentary governments go long periods of time without a no confidence vote, Italy , Israel , and the French Fourth Republic have all experienced difficulties maintaining stability. When parliamentary systems have multiple parties, and governments are forced to rely on coalitions, as they often do in nations that use a system of proportional representation , extremist parties can theoretically use the threat of leaving a coalition to further their agendas. Many people consider presidential systems more able to survive emergencies. A country under enormous stress may, supporters argue, be better off being led by a president with a fixed term than rotating premierships. France during the Algerian controversy switched to a semi-presidential system as did Sri Lanka during its civil war, while Israel experimented with a directly elected prime minister in In France and Sri Lanka, the results are widely considered to have been positive. However, in the case of Israel, an unprecedented proliferation of smaller parties occurred, leading to the restoration of the previous system of selecting a prime minister. The fact that elections are fixed in a presidential system is considered by supporters a welcome "check" on the powers of the executive, contrasting parliamentary systems, which may allow the prime minister to call elections whenever they see fit or orchestrate their own vote of no confidence to trigger an election when they cannot get a legislative item passed. The presidential model is said to discourage this sort of opportunism, and instead forces the executive to operate within the confines of a term they cannot alter to suit their own needs. Proponents of the presidential system also argue that stability extends to the cabinets chosen under the system, compared to a parliamentary system where cabinets must be drawn from within the legislative branch. Under the presidential system, cabinet members can be selected from a much larger pool of potential candidates. This allows presidents the ability to select cabinet members based as much or more on their ability and competency to lead a particular department as on their loyalty to the president, as opposed to parliamentary cabinets, which might be filled by legislators chosen for no better reason than their perceived loyalty to the prime minister. Supporters of the presidential system note that parliamentary systems are prone[ citation needed ] to disruptive " cabinet shuffles " where legislators are moved between portfolios, whereas in presidential system cabinets such as the United States Cabinet , cabinet shuffles are unusual. Criticism and disadvantages[ edit ] This section possibly contains original research. January Learn how and when to remove this template message Critics generally claim three basic disadvantages for presidential systems: Tendency towards authoritarianism â€” some political scientists say presidentialism raises the stakes of elections, exacerbates their polarization and can lead to authoritarianism Linz. Political gridlock â€” the separation of powers of a presidential system establishes the presidency and the legislature as two parallel structures. Critics

argue that this can create an undesirable and long-term political gridlock whenever the president and the legislative majority are from different parties, which is common because the electorate usually expects more rapid results from new policies than are possible Linz, Mainwaring and Shugart. In addition, this reduces accountability by allowing the president and the legislature to shift blame to each other. Tendency towards authoritarianism[ edit ] A prime minister without majority support in the legislature must either form a coalition or, if able to lead a minority government, govern in a manner acceptable to at least some of the opposition parties. Even with a majority government, the prime minister must still govern within perhaps unwritten constraints as determined by the members of his partyâ€”a premier in this situation is often at greater risk of losing his party leadership than his party is at risk of losing the next election. On the other hand, winning the presidency is a winner-take-all, zero-sum game. Once elected, a president might be able to marginalize the influence of other parties and exclude rival factions in his own party as well, or even leave the party whose ticket he was elected under. The president can thus rule without any party support until the next election or abuse his power to win multiple terms, a worrisome situation for many interest groups. Yale political scientist Juan Linz argues that: Winners and losers are sharply defined for the entire period of the presidential mandate The zero-sum game in presidential regimes raises the stakes of presidential elections and inevitably exacerbates their attendant tension and polarization. Some political scientists say that presidential systems are not constitutionally stable and have difficulty sustaining democratic practices, noting that presidentialism has slipped into authoritarianism in many of the countries in which it has been implemented. According to political scientist Fred Riggs , presidentialism has fallen into authoritarianism in nearly every country it has been attempted. On the other hand, an often-cited[ by whom? In a presidential system, the legislature and the president have equal mandates from the public. Conflicts between the branches of government might not be reconciled. When president and legislature disagree and government is not working effectively, there is a strong incentive to use extra-constitutional measures to break the deadlock. Of the three common branches of government, the executive is in the best position to use extra-constitutional measures, especially when the president is head of state, head of government, and commander-in-chief of the military. By contrast, in a parliamentary system where the often-ceremonial head of state is either a constitutional monarch or in the case of a parliamentary republic an experienced and respected figure, given some political emergency there is a good chance that even a ceremonial head of state will be able to use emergency reserve powers to restrain a head of government acting in an emergency extra-constitutional manner â€” this is only possible because the head of state and the head of government are not the same person. Presidents have ignored the legislature or bypassed it altogether. One president had the National Assembly teargassed, while another disagreed with congress until he was kidnapped by paratroopers. From through , Ecuador staggered through a succession of executive-legislative confrontations that created a near permanent crisis atmosphere in the policy. In Brazil , presidents have accomplished their objectives by creating executive agencies over which Congress had no say. Nelson in her book *Bad for Democracy* [5] sees the office of the President of the United States as essentially undemocratic [6] and characterizes presidentialism as worship of the president by citizens, which she believes undermines civic participation. This is common because the electorate often expects more rapid results than are possible from new policies and switches to a different party at the next election. It is easy for either the president or the legislature to escape blame by shifting it to the other. Douglas Dillon said "the president blames Congress, the Congress blames the president, and the public remains confused and disgusted with government in Washington". In such a scenario, each side can say they are displeased with the debt, plausibly blame the other side for the deficit, and still claim success. Impediments to leadership change[ edit ] This section does not cite any sources.

**Chapter 3 : What is the Difference Between a Parliamentary and Presidential System of Government?**

*Basis for Comparison Parliamentary form of Government Presidential form of Government; Meaning: In Parliamentary system the legislative and executive body of government are closely related, while the judiciary is independent of the other two bodies of government.*

Executive and legislative States may be classified as monarchical or republican and as having presidential or parliamentary executives. The United States, which possesses a presidential government, and the United Kingdom, which is the oldest practitioner of parliamentary government, have long served as models of their respective systems of executive authority, both for scholarly analysis and for the drafting of the constitutions of other countries.

**Monarchical systems** Although the institution of monarchy is as old as recorded history, since the beginning of the modern era many monarchies have been replaced with republics. Most of the executive powers are in the hands of ministers—headed by a prime minister—who are politically responsible to the parliament and not to the monarch. The executive powers of government in the United Kingdom, for example, are exercised by ministers who hold their offices by virtue of the fact that they command the support of a majority in the popularly elected House of Commons. A constitutional monarch can act only on the advice of the ministers. The position of the monarchs in Scandinavia and the Low Countries is similar to that of the monarch in Britain: In countries where no political party has a majority of its own in the parliament, the monarch may exercise some discretion in deciding whom to invite to form a government. Even where they have this discretion, however, monarchs must first consult with the various party leaders, a requirement that severely limits their freedom of action. In countries with stable two-party systems, all the monarch can do is offer the prime ministership to the leader of the majority party. Since the Swedish king has not even possessed this formal power; it is the president of the legislative assembly who chooses and appoints the prime minister. A constitutional monarch is the head of the state, not of the government. In a few monarchies, however—for example, those of Jordan, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia—the king exercises real powers of government. The ministers are chosen by and are responsible only to the king rather than to an elective parliamentary body. Hereditary rulers with this degree of personal power were quite common in the 18th century but are rare today. Although Jordan and Morocco have augmented the powers of their elected parliaments, the monarchs retain ultimate authority in those countries. In Thailand the constitution promulgated in greatly reduced the powers of the monarch, relegating him to a role similar to that of the European monarchs. Although he retained considerable formal powers, he could exercise them only upon the advice of elected leaders. His most important function was to serve as a living symbol of the country and as a focus of national unity.

**Presidential systems** By definition, presidential systems must possess three basic features. First, the president originates from outside the legislative authority. In most countries such presidents are elected directly by the citizens, though separation of origin can also be ensured through an electoral college as in the United States—see electoral college—or in Argentina before constitutional reforms were adopted in the mid-1950s, provided that legislators cannot also serve as electors. Second, the president serves simultaneously as head of government and head of state; he is empowered to select cabinet ministers, who are responsible to him and not to the legislative majority. And third, the president has some constitutionally guaranteed legislative authority. The president is neither selected by nor a member of the Congress. He is elected indirectly by the public through an electoral college for a fixed term of four years, and he holds office no matter how his legislative program fares in Congress and whether or not his political party controls either or both houses of Congress. The members of the cabinet, as noted above, are chosen by the president and are politically responsible to him though they must be confirmed by the Senate. The Constitution prohibits cabinet officials from serving simultaneously in Congress. Moreover, the president shares legislative powers with Congress: For further discussion, see presidency of the United States of America. Presidential systems may differ in important respects from the U.S. In terms of constitutional provisions, the most important variation is in the powers that the constitution delegates to the president. In contrast to the requirement that Congress need a supermajority to override a presidential veto in the United States, for example, in some countries e. Many

presidential constitutions e. Some countries with presidential systems require that cabinet appointments be approved by the legislature. In the Philippines appointments of cabinet ministers must be approved by a Commission on Appointments, which consists of members of both houses of the legislature. Once appointed, however, cabinet secretaries or ministers cannot be removed by the legislature, except by impeachment.

**Chapter 4 : Presidential system - Wikipedia**

*A parliamentary system is a system of democratic governance of a state where the executive branch derives its democratic legitimacy from its ability to command the confidence of the legislative branch, typically a parliament, and is also held acco.*

This is because the executive branch is dependent upon the direct or indirect support of the legislative branch and often includes members of the legislature. Thus, this would amount to the executive as the majority party or coalition of parties in the legislature possessing more votes in order to pass legislation. In a presidential system, the executive is often chosen independently from the legislature. If the executive and legislature in such a system include members entirely or predominantly from different political parties, then stalemate can occur. It could be said then that the will of the people is more easily instituted within a parliamentary system. In addition to quicken legislative action, Parliamentarianism has attractive features for nations that are ethnically, racially, or ideologically divided. In a uni-personal presidential system, all executive power is concentrated in the president. In a parliamentary system, with a collegial executive, power is more divided. It can also be argued that power is more evenly spread out in the power structure of parliamentarianism. The prime minister seldom tends to have as high importance as a ruling president, and there tends to be a higher focus on voting for a party and its political ideas than voting for an actual person. Parliamentarianism has been praised for producing serious debates, for allowing the change in power without an election, and for allowing elections at any time. The four-year election rule of the United States to be by some to be unnatural. There is also a body of scholarship, associated with Juan Linz, Fred Riggs, Bruce Ackerman, and Robert Dahl that claims that parliamentarianism is less prone to authoritarian collapse. These scholars point out that since World War II, two-thirds of Third World countries establishing parliamentary governments successfully made the transition to democracy. By contrast, no Third World presidential system successfully made the transition to democracy without experiencing coups and other constitutional breakdowns. Criticisms of parliamentarianism One main criticism and benefits of many parliamentary systems is that the head of government is in almost all cases not directly elected. In a presidential system, the president is usually chosen directly by the electorate, or by a set of electors directly chosen by the people, separate from the legislature. However, in a parliamentary system the prime minister is elected by the legislature, often under the strong influence of the party leadership. Another major criticism of the parliamentary system lies precisely in its purported advantage: Conversely, because of the lack of inherent separation of powers, some believe that a parliamentary system can place too much power in the executive entity, leading to the feeling that the legislature or judiciary have little scope to administer checks or balances on the executive. However, parliamentary systems may be bicameral, with an upper house designed to check the power of the lower from which the executive comes. Although it is possible to have a powerful prime minister, as Britain has, or even a dominant party system, as Japan has, parliamentary systems are also sometimes unstable. Critics point to Israel, Italy, Canada, the French Fourth Republic, and Weimar Germany as examples of parliamentary systems where unstable coalitions, demanding minority parties, votes of no confidence, and threats of such votes, make or have made effective governance impossible. Defenders of parliamentarianism say that parliamentary instability is the result of proportional representation, political culture, and highly polarized electorates. Although parliamentarianism has been praised for allowing an election to take place at any time, the lack of a definite election calendar can be abused. In some systems, such as the British, a ruling party can schedule elections when it feels that it is likely to do well, and so avoid elections at times of unpopularity. Thus, by wise timing of elections, in a parliamentary system a party can extend its rule for longer than is feasible in a functioning presidential system. In other systems, such as the Dutch and the Belgian, the ruling party or coalition has some flexibility in determining the election date. Conversely, flexibility in the timing of parliamentary elections avoids having periods of legislative gridlock that can occur in a fixed period presidential system. Additionally, prime ministers may lose their positions solely because they lose their seats in parliament, even though they may still be popular nationally. Supporters of parliamentarianism can respond

by saying that as members of parliament, prime ministers are elected firstly to represent their electoral constituents and if they lose their support then consequently they are no longer entitled to be prime minister. In parliamentary systems, the role of the statesman who represents the country as a whole goes to the separate position of head of state, which is generally non-executive and non-partisan. Promising politicians in parliamentary systems likewise are normally preselected for safe seats – ones that are unlikely to be lost at the next election – which allows them to focus instead on their political career.

**Chapter 5 : Advantages & Disadvantages of a Parliamentary System | Enfranchise's Blog**

*Parliamentary systems, unlike presidential systems, are typified by a fusion of powers between the legislative and executive branches. The Prime Minister (who is the chief executive) may be elected to the legislature in the same way that all other members are elected.*

History of Parliamentarism Since ancient times, when societies were tribal, there were councils or a headman whose decisions were assessed by village elders. Eventually, these councils have slowly evolved into the modern parliamentary system. In England, Simon de Montfort is remembered as one of the fathers of representative government for holding two famous parliaments. By the nineteenth-century, the Great Reform Act of led to parliamentary dominance, with its choice invariably deciding who was prime minister and the complexion of the government. Such a system became particularly prevalent in older British dominions, many of whom had their constitutions enacted by the British parliament; examples include Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the Irish Free State and the Union of South Africa. Some of these parliaments evolved were reformed from, or were initially developed as distinct from their original British model: In the radicalised times at the end of World War I, democratic reforms were often seen as a means to counter popular revolutionary currents. This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. January Further information: Parliamentary procedure A parliamentary system may be either bicameral , with two chambers of parliament or houses or unicameral , with just one parliamentary chamber. In the case of a bicameral parliament, this is usually characterised by an elected lower house that has the power to determine the executive government and an upper house which may be appointed or elected through a different mechanism from the lower house. Scholars of democracy such as Arend Lijphart distinguish two types of parliamentary democracies: The Westminster system originates from the British Houses of Parliament. The Reichstag Building in Berlin , Germany. The Consensus system is used in most Western European countries. The Westminster system is usually found in the Commonwealth of Nations and countries which were influenced by the British political tradition. Some parliaments in this model are elected using a plurality voting system first past the post , such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and India, while others use proportional representation , such as Ireland and New Zealand. The Australian House of Representatives is elected using instant-runoff voting , while the Senate is elected using proportional representation through single transferable vote. Regardless of which system is used, the voting systems tend to allow the voter to vote for a named candidate rather than a closed list. The Western European parliamentary model e. Spain, Germany tends to have a more consensual debating system and usually has semi-circular debating chambers. Consensus systems have more of a tendency to use proportional representation with open party lists than the Westminster Model legislatures. The committees of these Parliaments tend to be more important than the plenary chamber. In countries using this system, Members of Parliament have to resign their place in Parliament upon being appointed or elected minister. Ministers in those countries usually actively participate in parliamentary debates, but, are not entitled to vote. Implementations of the parliamentary system can also differ on the manner of how the prime minister and government are appointed and as to whether the government needs the explicit approval of the parliament, rather than just the absence of its disapproval. Some countries such as India also require the prime minister to be a member of the legislature, though in other countries this only exists as a convention. The head of state appoints a prime minister who will likely have majority support in parliament. While in practice most prime ministers under the Westminster system including Australia, Canada, India, New Zealand and the United Kingdom are the leaders of the largest party in parliament, technically the appointment of the prime minister is a prerogative exercised by the monarch, the governor-general, or the president. No parliamentary vote takes place on who is forming a government, but since parliament can immediately defeat the government with a motion of no confidence , the head of state is limited by convention to choosing a candidate who can command the confidence of parliament, and thus has little or no influence in the decision. The head of state appoints the leader of the political party holding a plurality of seats in parliament as prime minister. For

example, in Greece, if no party has a majority, the leader of the party with a plurality of seats is given an exploratory mandate to receive the confidence of the parliament within three days. If this is not possible, then the leader of the party with the second highest seat number is given the exploratory mandate. If this fails, then the leader of the third largest party is given it and so on. The head of state nominates a candidate for prime minister who is then submitted to parliament for approval before appointment. Spain, where the King sends a nomination to parliament for approval. Also, Germany where under the German Basic Law constitution the Bundestag votes on a candidate nominated by the federal president. In these cases, parliament can choose another candidate who then would be appointed by the head of state. Parliament nominates a candidate whom the head of state is constitutionally obliged to appoint as prime minister. Japan, where the Emperor appoints the Prime Minister on the nomination of the Diet. A public officeholder other than the head of state or their representative nominates a candidate, who, if approved by parliament, is appointed as prime minister. Under the Swedish Instrument of Government, the power to appoint someone to form a government has been moved from the monarch to the Speaker of Parliament and the parliament itself. The speaker nominates a candidate, who is then elected to prime minister statsminister by the parliament if an absolute majority of the members of parliament does not vote no. Direct election by popular vote. Israel, where the prime minister was elected in a general election, with no regard to political affiliation, and whose procedure can also be described as of a semi-parliamentary system. In some countries, such as Denmark, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand, the prime minister has the de facto power to call an election, at will. This was also the case in the United Kingdom until the passage of the Fixed-term Parliaments Act. In Israel, parliament may vote in order to call an election or pass a vote of no confidence against the government. Other countries only permit an election to be called in the event of a vote of no confidence against the government, a supermajority vote in favour of an early election or prolonged deadlock in parliament. These requirements can still be circumvented. The last time this option was used was in Norway is unique among parliamentary systems in that the Storting always serves the whole of its four-year term. The parliamentary system can be contrasted with a presidential system which operates under a stricter separation of powers, whereby the executive does not form part of nor is appointed by the parliamentary or legislative body. In such a system, parliaments or congresses do not select or dismiss heads of governments, and governments cannot request an early dissolution as may be the case for parliaments. There also exists the semi-presidential system that draws on both presidential systems and parliamentary systems by combining a powerful president with an executive responsible to parliament, for example, the French Fifth Republic. A few parliamentary democratic nations such as India, [16] Pakistan, and Bangladesh, have enacted an anti-defection law, which prohibits a member of the legislature from switching to another party after being elected. With this law, elected representatives lose their seats in parliament if they vote contrary to the directions of their party. Advantages and disadvantages[ edit ] This section has multiple issues. Please help improve it or discuss these issues on the talk page. Relevant discussion may be found on Talk: Please help to ensure that disputed statements are reliably sourced. December This section possibly contains original research. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. December Learn how and when to remove this template message One of the commonly attributed advantages to parliamentary systems is that it is faster and easier to pass legislation, [17] as the executive branch is formed by the direct or indirect support of the legislative branch and often includes members of the legislature. Thus the executive as the majority party or coalition of parties in the legislature has a majority of the votes and can pass legislation at will. In a presidential system, the executive is often chosen independently from the legislature. If the executive and the majority of the legislature are from different political parties, then stalemate can occur. Thus the executive might not be able to implement its legislative proposals. In addition to quicker legislative action, a parliamentary government has attractive features for nations that are ethnically, racially, or ideologically divided. In a presidential system, all executive power is vested in one person: In a parliamentary system, with a collegial executive, power is more divided. In the Lebanese Taif Agreement, in order to give Muslims greater political power, Lebanon moved from a semi-presidential system with a strong president[ dubious discuss ] to a system more structurally similar to classical parliamentary government. It can also be argued that

power is more evenly spread out in parliamentary government, as the government and prime minister do not have the ability to make unilateral decisions as the entire government cabinet is answerable and accountable to parliament. In his book *The English Constitution*, Walter Bagehot praised parliamentary governments for producing serious debates, for allowing for a change in power without an election, and for allowing elections at any time. Bagehot considered the four-year election rule of the United States to be unnatural, as it can potentially allow a president who has disappointed the public with a dismal performance in the second year of his term to continue on until the end of his 4-year term. Under a parliamentary system, a prime minister that has lost support in the middle of his term can be easily replaced by his own peers. Some scholars like Juan Linz, Fred Riggs, Bruce Ackerman, and Robert Dahl have found that parliamentary government is less prone to authoritarian collapse. These scholars point out that since World War II, two-thirds of Third World countries establishing parliamentary governments successfully made the transition to democracy. By contrast, no Third World presidential system successfully made the transition to democracy without experiencing coups and other constitutional breakdowns. A recent World Bank study found that parliamentary systems are associated with less corruption. Mixed-member proportional representation where voters cast two votes can make this choice easier by allowing voters to cast one vote for the local candidate at the constituency level but also cast a second vote for another party at the wider parliamentary level. Although Bagehot praised parliamentary governments for allowing an election to take place at any time, the lack of a definite election calendar can be abused. Previously under some systems, such as the British, a ruling party could schedule elections when it felt that it was likely to retain power, and so avoid elections at times of unpopularity. Thus, by a wise timing of elections, in a parliamentary system, a party can extend its rule for longer than is feasible in a functioning presidential system. In other systems, such as the Dutch and the Belgian, the ruling party or coalition has some flexibility in determining the election date. Conversely, flexibility in the timing of parliamentary elections can avoid periods of legislative gridlock that can occur in a fixed period presidential system. Such feature in being able to time elections whenever it is advantageous to the ruling party is not a real issue, however, as voters ultimately have the ability to still make the choice of whether to vote for the ruling party or not. It has been well-observed that the rankings of top-performing countries according to performance indices such as list of countries by GDP nominal per capita, Human Development Index, Global Competitiveness Report, Corruption Perceptions Index, and many more performance indexes feature most best-performing countries having parliamentary systems, while most worst-performing countries have presidential systems or strong-president semi-presidential systems. This also extends to the fact that majority - if not all - of the countries that dominate top ranks of lists like the Global Liveability Ranking, the Mercer Quality of Living Survey, the Henley Passport Index, and many such ranking lists use parliamentary systems. In contrast, the list of cities by murder rate shows an overwhelming number of cities found in countries that use presidential systems.

**Chapter 6 : Parliamentary system - Wikipedia**

*The parliamentary has dual executives, where the executive is separated into two offices and occupied by two different individuals: the head of state is occupied by a monarch, or president, and the office head of government is occupied by the Prime Minister.*

Public Financing Parliamentary System Countries around the world practice democracy through different types of institutions. However, most democracies in the world today use the parliamentary system as opposed to a presidential system like that used in the United States. Defining characteristics of the parliamentary system are the supremacy of the legislative branch within the three functions of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—and blurring or merging of the executive and legislative functions. The legislative function is conducted through a unicameral one-chamber or bicameral two-chamber parliament composed of members accountable to the people they represent. A prime minister and the ministers of several executive departments of the government primarily carry out the executive function. The prime minister usually is the leader of the majority party, if there is one, or the leader of one of the parties in the ruling coalition. Some ceremonial executive duties are carried out by a symbolic head of state—a hereditary king or queen in a democratic constitutional monarchy, such as Great Britain, Japan, Norway, or Spain, or an elected president or chancellor in a democratic constitutional republic such as Germany, Italy, or Latvia. The judicial function typically is independent of the legislative and executive components of the system. In a parliamentary system, laws are made by majority vote of the legislature and signed by the head of state, who does not have an effective veto power. In most parliamentary democracies, the head of state can return a bill to the legislative body to signify disagreement with it. In most parliamentary systems, there is a special constitutional court that can declare a law unconstitutional if it violates provisions of the supreme law of the land, the constitution. In a few parliamentary systems, such as Great Britain, New Zealand, and the Netherlands, there is no provision for constitutional or judicial review, and the people collectively possess the only check on the otherwise supreme legislature, which is to vote members of the majority party or parties out of office at the next election. A parliamentary democracy is directly and immediately responsive to popular influence through the electoral process. Members of parliament may hold their positions during an established period between regularly scheduled elections. However, they can be turned out of office at any point between the periodic parliamentary elections if the government formed by the majority party loses the support of the majority of the legislative body. A new prime minister and cabinet of executive ministers may be selected by newly elected members of the parliament. A few parliamentary democracies function as semi-presidential systems. They have a president, elected by direct vote of the people, who exercises significant foreign policy powers apart from the prime minister. They also have a constitutional court with strong powers of constitutional or judicial review. For example, the constitutional democracy of Lithuania is a parliamentary system with characteristics of a presidential system, such as a president of the republic who is directly elected by the people and who has significant powers regarding national defense, military command, and international relations. Advocates of the parliamentary system claim it is more efficient than the presidential alternative because it is not encumbered by checks and balances among power-sharing departments, which usually slow down the operations of government and sometimes create paralyzing gridlocks. Further, in the parliamentary system, a government that has lost favor with the people can be voted out of office immediately. Advocates claim that by responding more readily to the will of the people the parliamentary system is more democratic than the presidential alternative. However, both parliamentary and presidential systems can be genuine democracies so long as they conform to the essential characteristics by which a democracy is distinguished from a non-democracy, including constitutionalism, representation based on democratic elections, and guaranteed rights to liberty for all citizens.

**Chapter 7 : What are the differences between parliamentary and presidential systems of democracy? | eNO**

*Final Exam Learn with flashcards, games, and more " for free.*

Only the members of Parliament can be appointed as minister. Persons outside the legislature are appointed as ministers. Dissolution of lower house Prime Minister can dissolve the lower house before the expiry of its term. President cannot dissolve lower house. Tenure of Executive Fixed Definition of Parliamentary form of Government Parliamentary form of government represents a system of democratic governance of a country, wherein the executive branch is derived from the legislative body, i. Here, the executive is divided into two parts, the Head of the State, i. President, who is only the nominal executive and the Head of the Government, i. Prime Minister, who is the real executive. As per this system, the political party getting the maximum number of seats during federal elections, in the Parliament, forms the government. The party elects a member, as a leader, who is appointed as the Prime Minister by the President. After the appointment of the Prime Minister, the Cabinet is formed by him, whose members should be out of the Parliament. The executive body, i. Definition of Presidential form of Government When a country follows the Presidential form of Government, it denotes that there is only one person as the head of the state and government, i. The election of the President is made directly by the citizens of the country or sometimes by the members of the electoral college for a fixed period. The President elects some ministers as the Secretary and forms a small Cabinet, who assist in governing the country. Neither the President nor the Secretaries are accountable to the Congress Parliament for their acts. Indeed, they do not attend the sessions as well. Key Differences Between Parliamentary and Presidential form of Government The points presented below are important so far as the differences between parliamentary and presidential form of government is concerned: The Parliamentary system of government is one in which there exists a harmonious relationship between the legislative and executive body, while the judiciary body works independently. As against this, in Presidential form of government, the three organs of the government work independently of each other. In Parliamentary form of government, the executive is divided into two parts, i. On the contrary, the President is the chief executive of the Presidential form of Government. In the Parliamentary form of government, the executive body, i. Conversely, in the Presidential form of Government, there is no such accountability, i. Fusion of powers exists in the Parliamentary system, whereas the powers are separated in Presidential system. In Parliamentary form, only those persons are appointed as ministers in the executive body who are the members of Parliament. Unlike, in Presidential form, persons other than those working in the legislature can be appointed as secretaries. In Parliamentary government, the Prime Minister has the power to dissolve the lower house before the completion of its term. As opposed, the President cannot dissolve the lower house, in Presidential government. The tenure of the executive is not fixed in Parliamentary government, as in, if a no-confidence motion is passed in the Parliament, the Council of Ministers is dismissed. Contrary to this, the executive has a fixed term in the Presidential government. Conclusion The members of the cabinet possess double membership, i. Contrary to this, in the presidential form of government, the members of the cabinet possesses the membership of executive organ only. When it comes to dominance, in the Parliamentary System, the President is only the titular head, while the real powers lie in the hands of the Prime Minister. On the contrary, in the Presidential System, the President has got the supreme power.

**Chapter 8 : Constitutional law - Executives and legislatures | www.nxgvision.com**

*The main difference between a parliamentary and presidential system of government is that in a presidential system, the president is separate from the legislative body, but in a parliamentary system, the chief executive, such as a prime minister, is part of the legislative body, or parliament.*

**Chapter 9 : Difference Between Parliamentary and Presidential Form of Government - Key Differences**

*Best Answer: In a parliamentary system, the parliament chooses the executive (prime minister). The parliament claims authority to both make laws and execute them.*