

Free essay on french vs us constitution

[Countries](#), [United States](#)



The French constitution can be changed easily without sentimentality. What this means is that the French government does not consider the feelings of the people towards a particular issue when amending the constitution. The emotions that the people have about a certain law that is about to be considered is not taken into account when amending the French constitution. The results are that some people are usually left sad or unsatisfied when certain laws are amended.

When the constitution is amended without sentimentality, the general public feel left out in the process of making such a law. It may appear as if the law making body is more concerned about its interests as opposed to the interests of people they represent. In such cases, the people feel that democracy of representation is not being exercised (Schmitt, 72). Such laws may be difficult to implement since if the majority of the people are against the passing of the amendment, they will resist its implementation where possible. Amending the constitution without sentimentality may however be important if the government believes that the amendment is for the benefit of the majority of the citizens in the country.

What can be observed from the France is that constitution can be easily changed to meet the needs of the government. This depends on the feelings of the government and not what people feel. Even though the government is able to achieve its certain objectives easily by changing the constitution, there are problems associated with this system.

Evaluating the American constitution, it can be observed that the Americans are reluctant to changing their constitution. Usually, a complex procedure is involved if the constitution is to be amended. In addition, the feelings of the

people are considered if the constitution is to be changed. Therefore the representatives in the government have to consider the views of the people they represent before making their decision on what they are to support in the congress. This is a complex process that needs a lot of time and this is what makes constitutional amendment in United States slow and difficult. As for me, I think the American option is the best approach in this case. In the first place, this approach ensure democracy is fully exercised in that the people being represented have a chance to give their views about a major decision that is to affect their lives. Secondly, there is no need of changing the constitution now and then considering the fact that nothing much usually changes after elections. Therefore the tendency of new governments to pass laws so that the people can just feel its presence is eliminated (Schmitt, 83). This approach ensures that the constitution is only amended when there is a need. Therefore the legislators have no chance to amend the constitution for the sake of favoring their needs at the same time ignoring the feelings of the people they represent.

The American approach ensures that once the constitution is amended, the general public is in support of the new law and therefore its implementation becomes easy. In addition, the approach considers that there may be people in the legislature who oppose the government just because they are not part of it and therefore would wish to see it fail. In this regard, the approach ensures that the ill motives of such people are avoided. Generally, amendment of the constitution is a process that consumes time and therefore is expensive. In addition, the constitution is a very important document that should be only changed at the time of great necessity.

Therefore governments should avoid altering constitution unnecessarily.

The systems in a government can be changed by political parties when they collude with other agents. The presidential system can be changed when the legislature passes laws that require the change in the presidential system. In this regard, the political parties with the majority representatives in the congress may mobilize their members with an aim of making changes in the presidential system. At the same time, these political parties have to mobilize the citizens of the country by showing why there is a need to change the presidential system so that they can be in support of the new bill (Schmitt, 123). When the new bill is passed and given assent, the presidential system changes. The changes could be through bills aimed at reducing the powers of the president. The political parties can make the presidential system also through a similar process by facilitating passing of bills that empower the president. The presidential system can also be broken by passing a vote of no confidence to the president.

Another way of changing the presidential system is by facilitating the appointment of a prime minister. When a certain political party has majority votes in the legislature, it may require the president to appoint a prime minister whom he/she shares powers with. When this occurs, the powers of the president are reduced and as a result, parliamentary system is empowered.

Parties create a parliamentary system by encouraging its legislatures and the members of public to support bills that are meant to increase the powers of the legislature. When these powers are increased, most powers are exercised by the congress and therefore a parliamentary system is created.

The parties can also emphasize on the increase in number of areas represented by the legislatures. This increases the number of representatives in the legislature and therefore the parliamentary system is able to control greater resources in the country. Parties can however break the parliamentary system by colluding with the president to ensure that the bills passed by the parliament are not given assent. In this case, the parliamentary system is broken.

Cohabitation is a situation whereby the powers of the president are shared with a prime minister to facilitate the running of the government activities. This is a situation that is common in France. Cohabitation occurs when the president is not supported by the majority of members of the parliament. This means that majority of the members of the legislature belong to a different party from the party led by the president. When this occurs, the president is required to appoint a premier who he/she wants but this individual should be acceptable to the party with the majority seats. When cohabitation occurs, the president becomes in charge of international matters while the prime minister becomes in charge of the internal activities such as internal security (Schmitt, 96). Therefore the two leaders work closely with each other.

In the United States, what is called deadlock is present in the political system does not provide for appointment of the premier. In this regard, a deadlock is expected to be present in a situation whereby the parliament has more representatives coming from a political party different from that of the president. Usually, there are differences in deadlock in the United States and cohabitation provided for in the French constitution. In the case of

cohabitation, an individual who is not directly elected by the citizens comes is given powers of an individual elected by the citizens. To an extent, people are not able to completely exercise their right of democracy in cohabitation. The deadlock in the United States is usually eliminated in by the American constitution through the separation of powers. In United States, the president is not answerable to the parliament and therefore does not need the support of the parliament to carry out his/her responsibilities. However, cohabitation requires that another party intervenes to ensure presidential powers are shared with the parliament. This is why cohabitation changes presidential system to parliamentary system by empowering the parliament more.

In the United States, the president is both the head of states and the head of the government. However, when cohabitation occurs, the premier takes over and becomes the head of the government in some countries. In this case, the premier heads the ministers and therefore they become answerable to the prime minister and not the president.

It should be noted that the deadlock system in United States may pose some problems in that when the president has no enough support from the parliament, implementation of the government objectives becomes difficult. This is because the bills supported by the government fail to pass making the operations of the government difficult. However, the president may use his/her powers to deal with the problem for example veto powers can ensure that bills that receive the support of the president are passed.

Work cited.

Schmitt, Carl. Constitutional Theory. Durham, NC [etc.: Duke University Press, 2008. Print.

Page 72