

Difference between the usa and uk government type and the difference in the check...

[Science](#), [Social Science](#)



The differences between the UK's and USA's systems of checks and balances

There exist a number of differences between UK's unwritten checks and balances and USA's written checks and balances.

One of the differences between UK's unwritten checks and balances and the USA's written checks and balances is flexibility. U. K's unwritten checks and balances are easy to change and revise in order to address emerging needs.

On the other hand, USA's written checks and balances are relatively rigid and require long and procedural actions to change or review. That notwithstanding, USA's written checks and balances have the advantage of quick reference since they are contained in a single document. Conversely, UK's unwritten checks and balances are difficult because they are contained in different documents (Haus 458).

UK's unwritten checks and balances ascribe the legislature with sovereignty and other judicial bodies do not object the statutes that result from the legislature. In a way, this gives the government seemingly unconstrained power because the majority party has the power to pass many bills. USA's written checks and balances are different because they are codified and this gives them authority. These checks and balances limit and bind all political institutions and establish a hierarchy of law. USA's political institutions are subjected to judicial review, the judiciary can override a decision by the executive, and the executive can veto a decision made by the legislature (Haus 459).

UK's unwritten checks and balances recognizes the powers of the monarch as a forth arm of the government in the UK. For example, the queen can

dissolve or refuse to dissolve the parliament during emergency. On the other hand, USA's written checks and balances recognize the judiciary, legislature, and executive as the three arms of government. The checks and balances provide that only the executive can force the legislature to adjourn. UK's unwritten checks and balances provide that a judges' council appoint senior judicial elements. Conversely, USA's written checks and balances task the executive with the role of appointing judges that the legislature approves (Haus 460).

The unwritten checks and balances of the UK stipulate that courts can decide whether a document is a genuine Act. Different from this stipulation, USA's checks and balance allow the judicial arm of government to interpret the law. UK's unwritten checks and balance allows the Lord Chancellor to impeach judges while according to USA's checks and balances, the legislature can impeach judges. UK's unwritten checks and balances stipulate that the House of the Lords be not democratically elected whereas USA's written checks and balances explain that members of both houses of the Congress are democratically elected (Haus 461).

In conclusion, UK's unwritten checks and balances are flexible and easily adjustable whereas USA's written checks and balances are relatively rigid and difficult to check. It is more tedious to refer to UK's unwritten checks and balances that are written on different documents than to refer to USA's written checks and balances that are written on one document. The checks and balances of the UK allow the judiciary to decide on the genuineness of an act while according to the USA's checks and balances the judicial arm of

the government only interprets the law.

Works Cited

Haus, Charles. Comparative politics: Domestic Responses to global challenges. Stamford: Cengage Learning, 2014. Print.