

Q.1) Why was parliamentary form of government chosen over presidential form by the constitution makers in India? Do you think that the presidentialization of parliamentary form of government in recent times threatens the working of Indian polity?

Approach: Introduce your answer by contrasting parliamentary and presidential form of government. In the body, highlight the reasons why Parliamentary form of government was chosen over presidential form by the constitution makers in India. Then discuss recent trends which support the view that there has been increasing presidentialization of the parliamentary system. Conclude by presenting your own view on the issue.

In a parliamentary system of government, the executive is chosen from the legislature whereas a presidential form of government is one where executive head (President) is directly elected by the people.

Parliamentary form of government was chosen over presidential form by the constitution makers in India because:

- 1. Accountability: Due to colonial experience, India opted for a system of continuous accountability of executive through parliamentary system.
- 2. **Prior Experience**: Indian leadership already had some experience of running the parliamentary system under the **Acts of 1919 and 1935**.
- 3. The presidential system has the president as the chief executive and as source of all executive power. Therefore, a danger of personality cult to perpetuate existed.
- 4. Since the executive is a part of the legislature, and generally holds the majority, therefore it is **easier to pass laws and implement them** (reduced possibility of deadlock between executive and legislature).
- 5. India being a diverse country, parliamentary system **ensures a more representative and diverse cabinet.** Therefore, it was more suitable to Indian needs.

Presidentialization means a shift toward presidential form of government and decline in parliamentary control over executive. A trend toward presidentialization is visible through events like:

- 1. Style of elections: Election have now become person centric and not party centric. For example, 2019 Lok Sabha elections were fought with focus on Prime Ministerial candidate. People voted for executive (PM) and not legislators (MPs).
- 2. One person taking all decisions: Major decisions are taken individually or consulting only a few close aids. For example, during demonetisation only a few people had prior information.
- 3. Extensive use of **Ordinance** making power of President, as a way around parliamentary process.
- 4. **Passage of important bills without discussion. For instance**, the 2018 Finance Bill was passed by the Lok Sabha within 18 minutes without discussion.
- 5. **Recent scraping of Question Hour** decreases parliamentary accountability.

Despite the trend toward presidentialization, the root of parliamentary form of government is well founded. The constitution has provided various mechanism and institutions to preserve parliamentary form of government. Supreme court has also held that parliamentary form of government forms the basis structure of the constitution. People of India are resilient enough to protect its democratic principles as shown during the emergency era and subsequent win of the Janata Party. (379 words)