

TYPE OF PARLIAMENTARISM AND ITS POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

FORMA PARLAMENTARISMULUI ȘI CONSECINȚELE POLITICE ALE ACESTEIA

Doina CUCIURCA, ORCID: 0000-0001-6859-7956
Universitatea de Stat din Moldova

CZU: 342.53:321.7

e-mail: cuciurcadoina@gmail.com

Traditionally, the parliament is regarded as an attribute of the modern state, an important organ of power. Parliament is the only institution that represents the political community not only as a whole, but also in all its diversity. In modern developed political systems, the unification of political interests becomes one of the priority and specific tasks of parliaments. Attempts to diminish the role and importance of the parliament, to replace it with the executive power, indicate a low level of political and legal culture in the respective state. The political life of such countries is characterized by arbitrariness, abuses, high corruption of officials, the instability of the political situation, and the decrease in the standard of living of the population.

The aim of this research is to examine the origins and consequences of the mechanisms of different types of parliamentarism, as well as the impact of types of parliamentarism on political outcomes, such as government type, stability and the ability to respond to economic and political crisis.

In the political system of the countries of the modern world, the following types of parliamentarism are emerging: 1) developed, constrained, "imitative" parliamentarism (depending on the degree of actual achievement and the strength of the functional elements of parliamentarism); 2) "rationalized", "ministerial", "split" parliamentarism (depending on the constitutional order of interaction of the parliament with other supreme organs of state power).

In the first row of the types of parliamentarism are reflected the particularities of the political regime (totalitarian, authoritarian, democratic), and in the second row – the particularities of the form of government (republic, monarchy) and of the state arrangement (unitary, federal, confederal).

Developed parliamentarism can exist and function only in a democratic society, where the basic elements of parliamentarism are fully realized, including the principle of separation of powers and the rule of law, strong traditions of parliamentarism, where there is a mature civil society and political parties which are not limited to the role of active participants in political processes, but assume political responsibility for the general situation in society.

Constrained parliamentarism is based on limiting the powers of the parliament and its indirect control over the executive. This type of parliamentarism is characteristic of societies that approach parliamentarism in its development, where democratic freedoms and the fundamental principles of parliamentarism are mostly declarative, and the degree of their implementation is incomplete, having the character of half measures [1].

The existence of *imitative parliamentarism* is characteristic to highly authoritarian regimes and to a much greater extent - totalitarian regimes, where parliamentarism can only be imitated [2]. Within such regimes, power and politics are monopolized, power can govern only on the basis of laws, adopted at its discretion, the role of representative institutions and the opposition is diminished or reduced to zero, and the autonomy of parties and civil society institutions is violated.

Rationalized parliamentarism is oriented, first of all, to the consolidation of presidential power. This measure is determined by the need to overcome the weakness and amorphous character of the executive power, generating political instability. *Rationalized* parliamentarism incorporates elements characteristic of a semi-presidential republic, it provides for a series of restrictions on the organization, status and competence of the parliament. Within this type of parliamentarism, from a structural point of view, a bicameral parliament is preferable, because bicameralism is able to ensure the functioning of the system of restrictions within the parliament. The significant restrictions concern Parliament's legislative powers. This refers, first of all, to the fact that the president of the republic, at the proposal of the government (or the joint proposal of the chambers) can submit any bill to the referendum; secondly, the Constitution defines the spheres of legislative activity, assigned exclusively to the competence of the head of state [3].

Thus, under *rationalized parliamentarism*, strong presidential power is associated with effective parliamentary control over government activity, and the government's dual accountability – to the president and parliament - is a distinctive feature of *rationalized* parliamentarism.

Ministerial parliamentarism is defined by two fundamental principles – by the status of the parliament as the supreme legislative body without limiting its legislative and control powers, and by parliamentary governance, the accountability to the parliament of the government, formed, as a rule, on the basis of a parliamentary majority. At the same time, the government is empowered with the right of legislative initiative, as well as with the right to address the head of state with measures regarding the dissolution of the parliament. It is based, in most cases, on the compatibility of being a member of the government with the exercise of the mandate of member of Parliament. This allows the government to co-opt into the government not only leaders of the ruling parties, but also other influential deputies from the parliamentary majority, thus managing to control the parliament and at the same time benefit from the massive support of the parties [4].

Split parliamentarism is characteristic especially of societies, where the relations between the parliament and the head of state are based on a strict separation of powers, their considerable autonomy, the system of checks and balances and interdependence. Within this type of parliamentarism, the legislative (representative) body of state power

can limit the actions of the head of state through laws, while the president has the right of suspensive veto over the decisions of the parliament [5].

Conclusions. Despite the existence of several varieties of modern parliamentarism, we must note, however, that in the practice of parliamentarism there are no "pure" models, that is, isolated from all the others, because each of them, along with its own characteristic features, always includes features peculiar to other types of parliamentarism.

In the contemporary world, the trend towards the creation of hybrid, mixed, transitional forms of state government is increasingly foreshadowed. The classic forms of presidential, parliamentary or federal republic systems are gradually disappearing, being replaced by semi-presidential, semi-parliamentary republics, regional states, which combine the characteristics of unitarism, federalism and autonomy. The new methods of exercising state power cause the appearance of other forms of state regimes, which include some elements of authoritarianism and democracy.

In modern Western science, a number of concepts develop, according to which the state hypothetically transforms into an eminently "technical" or "scientific" state. It is considered that in such a state power loses its traditional political qualities and turns into a complex control device, designed to ensure the reasonable activity of society under conditions of strict observance of the principles of law. In this context, it is revealed that the exercise of public power is separated from the possession of property and is no longer under its decisive influence, that the real political power is concentrated in the hands of the government elite of state officials, independent of the economically dominant class.

References:

1. ALTINKÖK, S. *Constrained parliamentarism versus semipresidentialism in the context of the principle of the separation of powers*. [Accessed 04.09.2022]. Available: <https://dergipark.org.tr>.
2. LUKYANOVA, E. *Imitation Political Regimes as a New Political and Legal Reality. Political and Legal Analysis*. [Accessed 06.09.2022]. Available: <https://ras.jes.su>.
3. SIAROFF, A. *Varieties of Parliamentarianism in the Advanced Industrial Democracies*. [Accessed 06.09.2022]. Available: <https://www.jstor.org>.
4. CHEIBUB, A.J. Constitutional parliamentarism in Europe, 1800-2019. Fusaro, Carlo: *The End of Parliamentary Government in Europe*, *VerfBlog*, 2019/11/13, <https://verfassungsblog.de> <https://www.tandfonline.com>.
5. FUSARO, C. *The End of Parliamentary Government in Europe*, [Accessed 06.09.2022]. Available: <https://verfassungsblog.de>.