

© D.A. AVDEEV

ronner@mail.ru

UDC 342.38:342.384.9

### **CLASSIFICATION OF FORMS OF GOVERNMENT: A NEW APPROACH OR A SEARCH FOR CRITERIA**

*SUMMARY. This article considers the forms of government and reveals their distinctive features, their special characteristics. Some basic forms of government classification distinguished in modern science are analyzed. The author compares different forms of state government which help to discern general tendencies in their development, and makes a prognosis on the further development of monarchic and republican forms of government. In the present article, typical forms of government are studied and according to this research the author suggests new criteria and a classification of the forms of government. On the basis of this new approach to the classification of government forms, it is suggested to subdivide all forms of government not into republic and monarchy but into monocratia and polycratia, which in turn have their own models. It is emphasized that adoption of some features of a certain government form by another leads to the emergence of absolutely new models. This observation allows to speak about a diversity of means of organizing public authority and also of models of government.*

*KEY WORDS. Form of government, classification, types.*

Modern states possess distinctive features not only in historical and cultural traditions, level of social-economic structure, but also in public authority organization. The presence of other distinctive features does not prevent the classifying of states into definite groups based on various criteria.

One of the political-legal criteria used to distinguish states is the form of government, characterizing the order of forming and organizing the highest bodies of state power. The form of government reveals: the mode used when forming the highest bodies of state power; the subject exercising the supreme power, its responsibility to the population; the structure of the highest bodies of state power; the order of competence differentiation between the highest bodies of state power; the extent of population participation in the formation of the highest authority bodies [1].

The distinctive features of various forms of government, according to scholars researching the issue, depend not only on the definite combination of objective factors, but are based, first of all, on the peculiarities of the cultural-historical development of the nation and its political-psychological will, mentality. For example, according to Hegel, “people must feel that their state system conforms to their law and condition, otherwise, existing nominally, it will not possess either significance or value” [2; 274].

I.A. Ilyin believed that the form of government in a state is determined, first of all, by a nation's monarchical or republican sense of justice. "Every nation and every country, I.A. Ilyin wrote, is a living identity with its particular data, unique history, soul and nature", hence "every nation is assigned a specific, individual form of government and constitution, befitting only itself" [3;31].

Such opinions allowed the classification of states into definite groups (types), with republics on the one hand and monarchies on the other. As long ago as in Antiquity, philosophers divided all existing forms of government into proper and improper ones. According to our contemporary B.A. Osipyan, "all legitimate and illegitimate types of states can be relatively divided into monarchies and parliamentary republics, which, in their turn are divided into corresponding kinds" [4; 25].

"The legal division between a monarchy and a republic, emphasized the famous Russian lawyer F. Kistyakovsky, should be sought not in the competence of governmental power, but in its structure, in particular, in the legal position of the power possessor" [5; 298]. N.M. Korkunov, for his part, distinguished the political responsibility of the head of state as the basic element when classifying forms of government into monarchies and republics. "Precisely in this difference between responsibility and irresponsibility, he wrote, lies the difference between a republic's president and a monarch, and not in the amount or character of their functions. The President of the United States of America has more power than the English Queen; but the President is accountable to Congress, which is why he is not a monarch; the English Queen, on the contrary, has no responsibility, so although her power is limited, she is still a monarch" [6; 255].

In our opinion, the division of forms of government into two major groups, monarchies and republics is, conservative, old-fashioned and outdated. Taking into account the modern development of state institutions as such, we believe that it is necessary to work out new approaches to classification of forms of government. Sometimes difficulties arise when identifying forms of government in modern states and the method of creating a head of the state, as the basic difference between monarchy and republic has lost its validity.

Republic (derived from the Latin *res publica*, "public affair") presumes that the people take part in the administration of state affairs, from the formation of public authority to its responsibility and accountability to the electorate. In literature, a monarchy (derived from Latin *monarchia*, "autocracy") is treated as the form of government in which the ultimate state power belongs to one person. One can't but agree with Z.N. Kurdyukova's opinion that the difference between a monarchy and republic on the criteria of appointment by election, collective nature, short period of time, accountability, is rather relative [7; 60].

Classification of forms of government can be based on various criteria. The key one, as a rule, is the method of creation of the head of state: obtaining power as a result of elections or as a successor to the throne, the term of power and legal responsibility of the head of the state.

---

Even more complexities and sometimes confusions arise when trying to classify types of monarchical and republican forms of government. Thus, republics, despite the common features, are traditionally divided into presidential and parliamentary [8; 180]. The classic monarchy types are as follows: absolute, dualistic and constitutional [9; 90]. However, there are also different classifications.

The abundance of various models of republican forms of government allows us to come to the conclusion that the basic, i.e. “classic” types are presidential and parliamentary republics, and all others are variations on them. The independent model for a republic is a fused one (semi-presidential) [10; 592].

In our opinion, a new form of government emerges when some “classic” elements are mixed, and as a result appear “semi-presidential”, “semi-parliamentary”, “super-presidential” monocratic republics etc. A similar situation exists with monarchies.

The distinction between a monarchy and a republic is removed due to the transformation of one form of government into a different one, and as a result, so-called atypical (hybrid) forms of government appear [11; 109]. In particular, M.V. Baglai singles out a parliamentary-presidential model, which is close to semi-presidential, but different in respect of a more significant role for parliament, especially when forming a government [12; 141]. V.E. Chirkin, for example, along with presidential and parliamentary, mentions semi-presidential, semi-parliamentary, presidential-monocratic, super-presidential and military-presidential [13; 134].

Thus, the adoption of features of presidential and parliamentary republics leads to the appearance of their new types, complicating their systematization and identification. New forms of government include elements of various basic forms of government; in this respect, we suggest calling them synthetic.

Semi-parliamentary and semi-presidential republics can also be referred to as synthetic. However, one should take into account that the types of presidential and parliamentary republics distinguished by Russian scholars were not widely acknowledged and had no clear criteria of differentiation. In particular, V.E. Chirkin singles out the semi-presidential semi-parliamentary republic, characterized by greater governmental responsibility and limited ministerial accountability to parliament, with an increase in the quality of the latter (including changes in Houses and their ratio) and its role consolidation [13].

Republics are also classified based on different reasons. For example, M.M. Rassolov believes that the criterion to distinguish the types of republican forms of government is the order of executive power formation, i.e. executive power in a presidential republic belongs to the president, and in a parliamentary one to the head of the government [14; 84].

For O.I. Zaznaev, in a parliamentary republic, the head of state is not elected publicly and the government is accountable to the parliament. In a presidential republic, the head of state is elected publicly and the government is not accountable to the parliament. As for semi-presidential republics, the head of state is elected publicly and the government is accountable to the parliament, whereas in a semi-parliamentary republic the head of state is not elected publicly and the government is not accountable to the parliament [15; 367].

V.S. Nersesyants considered two kinds of republics, presidential and parliamentary, as constituting different variants of the separation of powers' principle implementation [16; 248]. A.S. Avtonomov classifies republics as parliamentary, presidential (dualistic), mixed (semi-presidential) and monocratic [17; 252 – 256]. M.V. Baglay speaks about parliamentary, presidential and semi-presidential republics [12].

V. Ivanov, guided exclusively by the practice of modern states (and taking into consideration the tradition to recognize parliamentary, presidential and mixed republics), suggests distinguishing the following types of republican government: 1) parliamentary-governmental, 2) parliamentary, 3) presidential, 4) presidential-parliamentary, 5) centralistic, 6) theological, 7) "people's" ("the state of the masses") [18].

Various terms with the word "president", for example, military-presidential, semi-presidential, semi-parliamentary, presidential-clerical, parliamentary-presidential republics etc., are used, according to Z.N.Kurdyukova, to characterize the distinctive features of political-legal regimes in particular presidential republics [7; 62]. However, in our opinion, these regimes are not political-legal, but most probably models of presidential and parliamentary republic organization, i.e. synthetic types.

This diversity in republican governmental models can be explained by the following circumstances. Firstly, synthesizing the features of one type of republic with the others results in a new type of republican government. Secondly, different criteria are used to classify republics at present.

The lack of distinct criteria to classify republican forms of government prevents their systematization. That is why sometimes a state can be treated as belonging to different types of republic, and at others it may be extremely difficult to define its form of government. In particular, it is still unclear what type of republic exists in Russia. One should note that in identifying the form of government of the Russian state and analyzing the same provisions of the Constitution text, scholars sometimes come to opposite conclusions.

That abundance of republican government types lets us come to the conclusion that the essential, i.e. "classic" types are parliamentary and presidential, all others being variations on these. In other words, a new model of republican government emerges due to the mixture of some features of the "classic" forms of government, and as a result, new forms of government, which are extremely hard to designate, appear. For example, what is the difference between a "semi-presidential" republic and a "semi-parliamentary" one? Or what does the notion "parliamentary-presidential" republic imply?

The fact that some republics and monarchies have much in common is worth considering. Thus, a parliamentary republic, as a matter of fact, possesses the characteristics of a parliamentary monarchy. Their basic difference lies in the mode of the head of state's creation (elective and inheritable accordingly), though the nominality of the head of state and government accountability to the parliament is common to both forms. Therefore, apparently, such forms of government are called parliamentary.

The mode of government formation, its political accountability and the method of head of state election are the key criteria for differentiating the types of government. Hence, if a government is formed (appointed) by a president, it is accountable to him, the head of the state, elected by extraparliamentary method and the head of the executive power *ex officio*. If a government is formed by a parliament, it is accountable to it, and a president is elected by the parliamentary method and does not participate in the procedure of government formation. Therefore, in the first case we mean presidential, and in the second, parliamentary republics.

If the government is formed by a president together with a parliament, the government bears double accountability (both to the president and parliament) and the president is elected by the extraparliamentary method, a mixed republic exists.

However, one should bear in mind that the method of head of state creation does not play a material part when defining a form of government. In our opinion, the major issue in this respect is in what way power is allotted, how public authority is executed and to whom it belongs. That is why it is appropriate to speak of monocratic and polycratic forms of government and their variations, and not only of republics and monarchies.

The new criteria enabling us to identify forms of government are as follows:

- principles of administration (whether the subject possessing the ultimate power is governed collectively or individually);
- the power allocation between the supreme bodies of state power;
- the presence of mutually binding authorities between the supreme bodies of state power in respect to each other.

Among the optional criteria of forms of government classification one can mention:

- the degree of population participation in the procedure of the state power bodies' formation;
- the structure of the supreme bodies of state power;

There is no doubt that this list of criteria is not exhaustive. One should bear in mind that, as a rule, the de-facto position of the highest authorities does not always correspond to the legal constructions determined in the Constitution.

The above-mentioned criteria, considered integrally, will let us avoid future confusion when defining any type of form of government. This will make it possible to recognize the distinctive features of public authority organization in any state, and systematize the existing models of public authority organization.

Thus, the form of government, as one of the external power attributes determining the organization of public authority in a country, represents a rather flexible and dynamic institution, exposed to changes subject to the current situation in politics. The features of forms of government allow us to construct various models of power organization. A wish for overcoming the imperfections of the basic forms of government by synthesizing various features of monocratic or polycratic forms of government will result in new variations emerging.

## REFERENCES

1. See: *Teorija gosudarstva i prava* [Theory of State and Law]. Lectures. Ed. N.I. Matuzov and A.V. Mal'ko. 2nd ed., revised, with additions. Moscow: Jurist, 2002. P. 79; *Teorija gosudarstva i prava* [Theory of State and Law]. Textbook for law schools and departments. Ed. by V.M. Korel'skiy and V.D. Perevalov. Moscow: NORMA-Infra M, 1999. P. 180 (in Russian).
2. Gegel', G. *Politicheskie proizvedenija* [Political works]. Moscow, 1978 (in Russian).
3. Il'in, I.A. *Pochemu my verim v Rossii: Sochinenija* [Why do we believe in Russias?: Works]. Moscow: Jeksmo, 2006 (in Russian).
4. Osipjan, B.A. The reasons for the diversity of the forms of state government and structure. *Sovremennoe pravo — Modern law*. 2009. No. 1 (in Russian).
5. Kistjakovskij, F. *Lekcii po obshhemu gosudarstvennomu pravu* [Lectures on the general state law]. Moscow, 1912 (in Russian).
6. Korkunov, N.M. *Lekcii po obshhej teorii prava* [Lectures on the general theory of law]. Saint-Petersburg, 1894 (in Russian).
7. Kurdjukova, Z.N. Theoretical problems of the political form of the modern state. *Pravovaja politika i pravovaja zhizn'* — Legal Policy and legal life. 2010. No. 4 (in Russian).
8. *Teorija gosudarstva i prava* [Theory of state and law]. A textbook for universities and law departments. Ed. by V.M. Korel'skiy, V.D. Perevalov. Moscow: NORMA-INFRA-M, 1999 (in Russian).
9. *Teorija gosudarstva i prava* [Theory of state and law]. A textbook. Ed. by V.K. Babaeva. Moscow: Jurist, 2002 (in Russian).
10. Kerimov, D.A. *Problemy obshhej teorii prava i gosudarstva* [Problems of the general theory of law and the state]. A coursebook. 2nd ed. Tyumen: Tjumenskij gosudarstvennyj universitet publ., 2005 (in Russian).
11. Chirkin, V.E. Atypical forms of government in the modern state. *Gosudarstvo i pravo — State and law*. 1994. No. 1 (in Russian).
12. Baglaj, M.V. *Konstitucionnoe pravo Rossijskoj Federacii* [The constitutional law of the Russian Federation]. A coursebook. 6th ed., add. and rev. Moscow: Norma, 2007 (in Russian).
13. Chirkin, V.E. *Konstitucija: rossijskaja model'* [Constitution: the Russian model]. Moscow: Jurist, 2004 (in Russian).
14. Rassolov, M.M., Malahov, V.P., Ivanov, A.A. *Aktual'nye problemy teorii gosudarstva i prava* [Current issues of the theory of state and law]. A coursebook. 2nd ed., rev. and add. Moscow: JuNITI-DANA: Zakon i pravo, 2010 (in Russian).
15. Zaznaev, O.I. *Poluprezidentskaja sistema: teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty* [Semi-president system: theoretical and practical aspects]. Kazan, 2006 (in Russian).
16. Nersesjanc, V.S. *Obshhaja teorija prava i gosudarstva* [General Theory of Law and State]. A coursebook for law schools and departments. Moscow: NORMA-INFRA, 2002 (in Russian).
17. Avtonomov, A.S. *Konstitucionnoe (gosudarstvennoe) pravo zarubezhnyh stran* [Constitutional (state) law of foreign countries]. A coursebook. Moscow: TK Velbi, Prospekt, 2005 (in Russian).
18. Ivanov, V. *O forme gosudarstvennogo pravlenija* (On the form of state government). Available at: <http://raikkonen2007.livejournal.com/74948.html> (in Russian).