

Analysis of the death penalty and presidential, parliamentary systems

[Politics](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Analysis of the Death Penalty and Presidential, Parliamentary Systems

1. A Supreme Court decision on the death penalty would differ in several details from an editorial written on the same topic. The Supreme Court Decision would be recorded in print and delivered as a verdict, with supporting arguments that cite previous cases as well as certain laws and assumptions. The decision would also allow for a justice to state his or her misgivings, but would have an overall intent of delivering a decision that is in compliance with both established law and relevant preceding cases, rather than persuading the audience that the justice's opinion is correct. Justices can often state in their decisions what they believe is right or wrong, but this can sometimes be in contradiction to their overall decision. Thus, overall, a Supreme Court decision would offer a verdict and explain that it is valid because it complies with the Constitution and other laws. An editorial would be more rhetorical in nature, as it would not cite the legality of the death penalty as well as its preceding use as evidence supporting its current use, as this would be arguing why the death penalty is Constitutional or not. Instead, the editorial would persuade the reader why the death penalty is or is not necessary, efficient, or of use, regardless of its legal status, and thus the writer would have a goal of being subjective and persuasive rather than objective and decisive.

2. Official agreements between countries tend to closely resemble the structure of a contract. They provide for the conditions of the contract, the duration of the contract, and who is involved. They would also list exceptions and contingencies for violation of the contracts. It would of course be written and express, rather than being verbal or implied, so that the relationship and

agreement between countries is clearly defined and stated. These serve the purpose of legally binding countries to one another and to a standard, in order to assure compliance with any agreement and a reference for the terms. Beyond that, the purpose may be to call for a country to implement certain legislation as dictated. One example is the Kyoto Protocol, which attempts to binds countries to certain environmental regulations and standards. Another is the Sykes-Picot agreement, which divided the jurisdiction of the Middle East between Britain and France, among other designations of the land. A third example is the Schengen Agreement, which binds five European nations into a community allowing free movement and employment across borders. These can be very difficult to enforce, because some require a pooling of agencies in different governments, while others depend on the compliance of third parties. Also, agreements that require action on the part of one or more countries may not have a means of ensuring such action, making enforcement extremely difficult.

3. Presidential systems offer a different separation of power that a parliamentary system would. The presidential system has a stronger executive department in a separate branch from the legislature, and thus the legislature finds it has less enforcement power as well as no responsibility for actual forming a government. This allows a more efficient and uninterrupted flow of government affairs than in a parliamentary system. The United Kingdom operates under a parliamentary system, and thus sees that the Prime Minister must form a cabinet, and often depends on party coalitions and other resolutions that force compromise and allow for more open, chaotic debate. The United States, however, operates on a

presidential system, where the president forms the cabinet separately from the leader of the legislative body and is not responsible for forming coalitions or resolving other differences within the legislature. Overall, the two different primarily in concentration of power and in structure.