

1: List of current sovereign monarchs - Wikipedia

Monarchy is a term used to define a government ruled by single person such as a king or queen. Monarchy involves a hereditary chain of command, which means only descendants or relatives of the king, queen, or emperor can take over power in the event of their death.

In a sense we are one step removed from it but it is only one step and not a large one in that, we live in a world order created by the Allied victory in World War II and opinion is pretty much unanimous that there would have been no World War II if there had not been a World War I. However, it was not just the political changes and the shifts in world power that brought this about but also a reaction against the values, social norms and a myriad other things that existed before the First World War that has shaped our life as it is today. One of those things was the turn away from traditional monarchy toward various democratic and republican ideologies. There were also some things that existed before but became much more dominant in the aftermath. For instance, nationalism certainly existed before World War I, indeed it was one of a number of subsidiary causes of the conflict. However, in many places nationalism was ratcheted up considerably afterwards, particularly in Central Europe. Socialism, similarly, certainly existed before World War I and the world prior to was certainly not one of pure, unadulterated capitalism, but after World War I there was a much more widespread rejection of capitalism in favor of socialism. It had existed previously but never before were entire regimes based on socialism and expanding socialism in various forms from the National Socialism of Germany to the international socialism of the Soviet Union. The United States was not untouched by this, going in a much more socialist direction under the FDR administration. Even in the regimes that denounced socialism, there was still an effort to create and advance some new sort of mixed economy that rejected capitalism as well. As it concerns monarchy, those on the Allied side had survived but none were as secure as they were before World War I. In Britain, socialist agitation grew rapidly, particular in the trade unions and was one of the reasons, even before the war ended, of Britain refusing asylum to the Russian Imperial Family. The British Empire had expanded but it was far from secure economically. America had surpassed Britain as the largest economy around and Britain had gone heavily into debt to the United States in the Great War and would do so even further in World War II. The Kingdom of Belgium came out of the conflict in better shape than most but even there radical parties rose up that threatened national unity. In the Kingdom of Italy, communist subversion was rampant with strikes and riots breaking out at such regularity that the country seemed on the verge of revolution before Mussolini and his blackshirts suppressed them, taking power in the process. This, combined with the failure of the other Allies to make good on the extensive promises they had made to induce Italy to join the war all helped bring the Fascists to power. If that had not happened, that might have been enough to prevent the rise of Nazi Germany alone since Adolf Hitler made no secret of the fact that Mussolini has been his inspiration and the Fascist March on Rome convinced him that he could do the same in Germany. And it was specifically the loss of the monarchies of Germany and Austria-Hungary that was responsible. With the economic tumult that Germany went through, it is possible that Hitler could have still managed to have become a significant political figure not as likely, but possible. However, there is simply no way that someone like him could have come to power and maintained himself in power if Kaiser Wilhelm II had still been on the German and Prussian thrones. Under the constitution of the German Empire, the Chancellor was not elected by anyone but appointed by the Kaiser. Before the First World War, only one chancellor was appointed who was not a prince or aristocrat and the idea that an Austrian commoner with no higher education and no record of any sort of success behind him at all could have been appointed by the Kaiser is simply beyond belief. And, of course, even if he had been, he could have been dismissed at any time. There is simply no way Hitler could have become dictator of Germany if the monarchy had been retained after the First World War. Much of the motivation for Japanese involvement on the Asian mainland was, after all, the result of the expansion of the Soviet Union with Soviet-backed communists taking control of Mongolia and supporting a growing subversive element in the Republic of China. Were it not for these communist threats, all of which came about as a result of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, there may have been no need for Japanese

intervention in China. Similarly, for the wider war, it all started because of the provocations of the Roosevelt administration aimed at forcing Japan to take aggressive action which would turn public opinion in favor of American intervention in World War II, specifically in Europe. If there had been no war in Europe, there likely would have been no application of American pressure against Japan leading to war. There would also have not been the antagonism between Japan and the Western Allies that grew as a result of the Japanese delegates to Versailles being ignored and the later naval arms reductions agreements which treated Japan as a second-class power to Britain and America. But, to stay on course, this about the results of monarchies falling, not the war itself. One major but often overlooked example is the Indian subcontinent. There the world has seen horrific violence brought about by the partition of the Empire of India into the republics of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh originally East Pakistan but also a continuous stand-off, with both sides now possessing nuclear weapons. There would have been a move for independence in any event and it would have been achieved in any event, both because it is only natural for people to resent being ruled by others and also because the British could have never maintained their rule by force. From the very beginning, British rule in India was based on voluntary cooperation; it is not as though British forces actually conquered the whole subcontinent and subdued an empire of million against their will. However, the end of the monarchy when it happened and as it happened proved disastrous. In the best of times, the British monarch as Emperor of India had united people, inspiring them to work together and take pride in being part of something that was far greater than they could ever be on their own. India was not independent, but it was not as though it was thought of with contempt, rather, it was the crown jewel of the British Empire. If one is to be a possession, one would certainly prefer to be the greatest and most prized possession. In the worst of times, the imperial monarchy had provided a common enemy to unite Hindu and Muslim nationalists. Once it was gone, all they had was their own animosity. Lord Mountbatten, the last Viceroy, tried to bring both sides together but it was to no avail and one by one the parts of the former Empire of India abandoned the status of Commonwealth Realms to become republics. Independence was to be welcomed as it would benefit both sides but if the Empire of India could have been maintained, whether with a Viceroy in personal union with the British Crown or under a restored Indian monarch, so much terror and bloodshed might have been avoided, not only in the conflicts between India and Pakistan but as a result of the support from radical elements inside Pakistan to terrorist forces and rogue regimes around the world. Former Japanese prime minister, prior to his execution by the Allies, General Hideki Tojo correctly predicted that Korea would be the battleground between the communist and anti-communist forces of the world. Without the Great War there would have been no conflict in Korea as there would have been no Soviet Union to occupy the north after partition and no Communist China to save North Korea from total defeat. If there had been no World War II there would have been no partition of Korea at all as it would have remained a constituent kingdom within the Empire of Japan. Even if events would have transpired to make independence happen, it still might have made a difference to preventing the Korean War if there had not been such a rejection of monarchy. It could have been perfectly simple; restore the Kingdom of Korea or Han Empire as you please as it existed prior to with no other powers gaining a foothold. Still, at minimum, the basic fact remains that without the communist influences of the Soviets, whose state was a direct result of the Great War, there would have been no Korean War and no tense standoff on the Korean peninsula which continues today. In similar vein, one can look at all the small anti-colonial wars that swept across Africa in the wake of World War II. All of these were the result of communist subversion supported by the Soviet Union which send in political officers, weapons and lots of propaganda. Again, it is hard to imagine European rule continuing but the process of independence would have been much more peaceful and less traumatic. There might also still be an Emperor in Ethiopia had it not been for Soviet-backed subversion on the African continent. Likewise, often overlooked probably because it was so successful was the British anti-communist campaign in Malaysia. This was farther removed from the Great War but were it not for the Soviet support for the communists in China there might have been no communist uprising in Malaysia. This started out as an almost purely Chinese communist movement and during World War II it was even supported by the British because the Chinese communists were so anti-Japanese not too different from American support going to Vietnamese communists because they were

anti-Japanese. For that matter, would there have been a war in Vietnam? It seems not or at least not nearly so disastrous a war or series of wars as it was. Again, without the Great War there would have been no Soviet Union and the Soviets became the primary backers of North Vietnam, there would likely have been no communist China and possibly no World War II which was when Vietnam was first partitioned. Without World War I there also would have been no promises from the Allies which encouraged subject peoples in colonies around the world to think that independence was right around the corner only to then be all the more disappointed when this proved not to be the case. There would have then been no crackdowns and massacres such as were seen in every country of the Eastern Bloc. There would have been no division of Germany and just imagine how much more prosperous Eastern Europe, including Russia, might be today if they had not spent so many decades in the shackles of Soviet communism. The possibilities are almost endless. Looking at the Middle East, there is no case more simple to illustrate the effects of World War I since so little has changed since then, World War II not touching too much on the region. The ISIS terrorists causing so much trouble today would have no reason to exist as their caliphate would still be standing in the form of the Ottoman Empire. Of course, saying that, it must also be pointed out that, at the time of the Great War, the caliphate was not foremost on the minds of the Arab Muslims at that time. It is rather ironic to see these gangs and armies of Arab Muslims today fighting for an Islamic caliphate when, during the First World War, it was the Arab Muslims who fought alongside Christian powers like Britain and France to bring down the Ottoman Empire and thus, ultimately, the last Caliph of Islam who was the Ottoman Sultan. There were tensions, of course, that would have existed in any case but changes were coming, whether when Archduke Franz Ferdinand came to the throne or when Charles I received the crown. Both favored some changes, whether to unite the Slavic peoples into a third constituent kingdom or to federalize the whole empire. In any event, much of the anger would have been dissipated and for what remained there was the combined strength of the others under the Imperial Crown to prevent it from becoming problematic. There may still have been some conflict between the Hapsburg Empire and Serbia but, perhaps, after shedding some other smaller minorities and their territory to win wider support, the Slavs would have become united as part of the Hapsburg empire. Who is to say? In any event, had Austria-Hungary not been dissolved there would have been no Croatian and Slovenian Wars, no Bosnian War and no ethnic cleansing such as was seen in the traumatic break-up of Yugoslavia. Whether Europe, Asia or Africa there are few major, modern conflicts that have not been a direct or at least indirect result of the First World War. Australia was affected as was North America with South America probably having been the least impacted, though even there the case can be made that the economic consequences played a part in the revolutions that caused so much warfare and turmoil. If World War I had never happened the world would be a much better place and even if it had happened, at least to some extent, people all across the globe would have been spared considerable suffering if the monarchs of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Russia had not lost their thrones in the process.

2: Monarchy of Denmark - Wikipedia

Royalty of the World at Windsor Castle for Queen Elizabeth II's Diamond Jubilee May 18, Front row (L-R): HIM the Emperor of Japan, HM the Queen of the Netherlands, HM the Queen of Denmark, HM the King of the Hellenes, HM the King of Romania, HM the Queen of the United Kingdom, HM the King of Bulgarians, HM the Sultan of Brunei, HM the King of Sweden, HM the King of Swaziland, HSH the.

Is it the case, some historians have asked, that we have King John all wrong? That he was actually not as bad as legend makes out? In the first place, he was treacherous: He was also lecherous: Most of all, John was shockingly cruel. In a chivalrous age, when aristocrats spared their enemies, capturing them rather than killing them, John preferred to do away with people by grisly means. On one occasion, for example, he ordered 22 captive knights to be taken to Corfe Castle in Dorset and starved to death. Another time he starved to death the wife and son of his former friend, William de Briouze. In he arranged the murder of his own nephew and rival for power, Arthur of Brittany. Clare Kendall John might have got away with such nefarious acts had he not also been politically incompetent. At the start of his reign in , he inherited the greatest dominion in Europe – not just England and large parts of Wales and Ireland, but also the whole western half of France: Normandy, Brittany, Anjou and Aquitaine. Yet within five years, he had lost almost all these continental territories to Philip Augustus. To raise the massive armies and fleets this enterprise would require, he wrung unprecedented sums of money from England. Taxes were suddenly demanded on an almost annual basis. Nobles were charged gargantuan sums to inherit their lands. Royal justices imposed exorbitant fines for trifling offences. The lands of the Church were seized, and the Jews were imprisoned and tortured until they agreed to pay up. But it was all for nothing. When the king finally launched his long-planned continental campaign in , it was a disaster. John, true to form, shied away from battle when challenged by French forces, and his allies in the north were defeated in a decisive clash with Philip Augustus. He returned to England that autumn with his treasury empty and his dreams of re-conquest in tatters. Clare Kendall With their tyrannical ruler over a barrel, his subjects demanded reform. John dodged their demands for six months, until in May they came out in open rebellion and seized London. With his capital held against him, the king was forced to negotiate, and obliged to make concessions when he met his critics the following month at Runnymede. Such is the general background that led to Magna Carta, a charge-sheet aimed squarely at King John and his many acts of misgovernment. The king did not issue it willingly, but under pressure from his opponents and in the hope of buying time. As soon as the meeting at Runnymede had broken up, John wrote to the pope complaining that the charter had been exacted under duress, and the pope obligingly declared it invalid. Within a few weeks both sides were again at war. Exclusive access to the historic text King John did not survive for much longer. Worn out by the exhaustion of fighting a losing war, he contracted dysentery in October and died a few days later at Newark Castle. Its most contentious clauses, that allowed the barons to make war on the king should he transgress, were removed, but the bulk of the detail remained. Today the detail is no longer relevant. King John had indulged in precisely that sort of unjust behaviour, and his subjects had called him to account for it. Marc Morris is the author of King John: Treachery, Tyranny and the Road to Magna Carta.

3: Monarchy - Wikipedia

A monarch is the head of a monarchy, a form of government in which a state or polity is ruled by an individual who normally rules for life or until abdication, and typically inherits the throne by birth.

Rod Abhari Performing Monarchy: The warrior escorts, adorned with cow tails and clutching knob- stick and shield, are sternly intent on their duties and seem contemptuous of tourists, but the girls are all smiles. During the eight-day ceremony, performed in late August, girls cut reeds and present them to the Queen Mother and then perform a ritual dance. The dance begins on the sixth day, when the girls present the reeds to the Queen Mother in a public ceremony. Dressed in a loose outfit of colored sashes and a tasseled skirt, the girls dance, breasts exposed. Only childless, unmarried girls can take part. Although not compulsory, the festival is widely attended by Swazis, including the King and Queen, and it is considered shameful for an unmarried Swazi girl not to participate Masango, The ceremony is a vivid example of the traditionalism that is both a source of national pride and international recognition for Swaziland, a country well-known for being the only remaining monarchy in Africa Thekingdomofswaziland. It offers the visitor a unique experience. These include wearing a sarong which can be bought from a street vendor for around 50E , and receiving a media accreditation permit, for pictures Thekingdomofswaziland. Although media depictions of the event emphasize the traditionalism of the ceremony, the Umhlanga is also a profoundly modern event. Evidently, despite its insistence on being a traditional ceremony, the Umhlanga is by no means immune to modern influences. Since then, the monarchy has dominated the political and cultural system of Swaziland. Despite these emblems of Western consumerism, the King nevertheless insists that modernization is a corruption of the Swazi way of life Rosen Through historical overview and textual analysis, I argue that Umhlanga has been crafted to legitimate a monarchy increasingly threatened by the crises of modernity. Theory and Methods In this section, I introduce the methods I use to understand Umhlanga in its context. I also discuss a methodological problem and how it limits the scope of my conclusion. Theory At its core, Umhlanga is a ritual. This is to say that it serves an ideological interest in organizing society in, but also that various actors can negotiate these interests over time. According to Jean Comaroff, Every ritual event is a complex, unique occasion created by specific individual action in specific social circumstances and interpreted and reinterpreted by all the actors directly or indirectly involved [According to David Kertzer, Ritual is a ubiquitous part of modern political life. Through ritual aspiring political leader struggle to assert their rule, incumbent power holder seek to bolster their authority, and revolutionaries try to carve out a new basis of political allegiance. Political figures from leader of a status quo use rites to create political reality for the people around them. Through participation in the rite, the citizen of the modern state identifies with larger political force that can only be seen in symbolic form. According to Anthony Giddens, Tradition is a mode of integrating the reflexive monitoring of action with the space organization of the community. It is a means of handling time and space, which inserts any particular activity or experience within the continuity of past, present and future, these in turn being structured by recurrent social practices. Tradition is not wholly static, because it has to be reinvented by each new generation as it takes over its cultural inheritance from those preceding it. Tradition does not so much resist change as pertain to a context in which there are few separated temporal and spatial markings in terms of which change can have any meaningful form. The Umhlanga ceremony has many meanings, and my attempt in this paper is to provide a context to make sense of the varied, even contradictory, textual meanings. Methods My study suggests that Umhlanga has undergone a variety of changes since its inception, and that these changes are indications of changing political interests. This is not a particularly controversial thesis, given how rituals are a dynamic and politically entrenched social process Kertzer, Since there are several studies on contemporary representations of Umhlanga, I expected to be able to trace an adequate social history in my literature review. However, despite many hours of research into Swaziland historical documents, including Swaziland history textbooks and early anthropological studies, I found almost no information on the Umhlanga before the mid s. However, I was only able to find one study Masango that actually used these sources to gather information on the history of Umhlanga. I rely extensively on his study, but by itself, it

cannot give us a complete picture of the historical evolution of Umhlanga. Umcwashi is a chastity rite designed to inculcate traditional sexual morality in virgin girls Matsebula, Umcwashi refers to both the custom and the wool tassels worn throughout the rite. According to James Matsebula p. Those who break the rules are fined. The ritual thus formed an important social function in imposing and reproducing gender norms. This is supported by the historical record. The most recent umcwashi ran between September, , through August Oral accounts recorded by Lomagugu Masango underscore how much the event has changed. According to Masango, Informants revealed that participation of young children in the event is a new phenomenon. Since there were no radios during our time, area tindvuna or forerunners traveled from one homestead to the next announcing the commencement of Umhlanga. Parents were warned against deterring their girls from participating or else they would be fined. The journey was difficult as we carried our sleeping mats, blankets and foodstuff on our heads. We did not mind the difficulties we encountered along the way. What was important for us was to participate and perform in the one and only ritual that was set apart for us as tintfombi takaNgwane or maidens of the Swazi nation. Masango , Tinkhundla Rule, Cultural Hegemony Tinkhundla rule has characterized the political system in Swaziland since , when Britain granted Swaziland independence and King Sobhuza II re-ascended the throne. The influence of the King is even more marked in the Senate, the second chamber, which is composed of twenty members, of whom half are elected by the House of Assembly and half appointed by the King. Finally, it is the King who selects the Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet. According to the proclamation, The constitution has permitted the imposition into our country of highly undesirable political practices, alien and incompatible with the way of life of our society, and designed to disrupt and destroy our own peaceful and constructive and essentially democratic method of political activity: Levin , Here is a direct example of how the supposed traditionalism of the Swazi people was used to justify a blatant violation of Swazi rule of law. Historically, Swazi kings have had profound cultural influence. According to a local Chief, Chief Jubiphathi Magagula, Swazi culture and traditions are God given and will continue to be practiced as long as the Swazi monarchy exists. Do you remember King Solomon in the bible? God ordains kings and without them there would be no nations. Each time a Swazi King ascends the throne, he is by tradition expected to walk in the footsteps of his father. He is obliged by custom and culture to practice and perpetuate Swazi rituals. Masango , 57 The rise of Umhlanga During the later half of the reign of King Sobhuza Umhlanga became prominent among the resuscitated traditional activities Masango , 1. The primary focus of the meeting was on the appropriateness of the attire of the dress code during Umhlanga. According to Matsebula, To some, European tradition was equated with Christianity, and anything that was not based on the European way of life was unchristian. Western dress, even the all-revealing mini skirt, was acceptable. There is little available research on how the ceremony evolved between the conference and the early s, after which the Umhlanga became a major tourist affair Masango, Matsebula notes that Umhlanga was sporadic until , which it became an annual tradition. This again suggests the malleable nature of the ceremony. Swaziland currently has the highest HIV prevalence rate in the world, at 26 percent of the adult population Cdc. The girls also sing about the dangers of AIDS in chants embedded with conservative ideologies of sexuality and gender. One of these chants is replicated below Masango , Lead singer Inyandzaleyo Malangeni! Finally, although the performance generally supports the status quo, significant subversion and inversions mark the contemporary Umhlanga. The event caused public outrage among Swazis, many of whom felt that the party was immoral and undermined the ceremony entirely. These features of the contemporary Umhlanga demonstrate both the social solidarity and fragmentation the event has produced. By participating in the Umhlanga, Swazi girls not only perform Swazi culture: Conclusions The contemporary Umhlanga truly is awe-inspiring, bringing in upwards of 40, bare- chested Swazi girls and featuring a direct address by the only remaining monarch in Africa. Despite what tourists may assume, however, Umhlanga is not an ancient Swazi tradition. This surprising beginning cannot be overlooked in contemporary readings of Umhlanga. As a state- sponsored ritual, Umhlanga must be understood within its political context. My insistence on historically situating the event, however, does not suggest that the Umhlanga has a singular purpose- the ceremony can, and should, be read from a variety of different perspectives. Historically, Swaziland has functioned largely as a periphery for South African tourism, and has

only recently begun to attract a diverse tourism market Harrison , Forsyth-Thompson As a highly visible and well-discussed ceremony, Umhlanga may fill an important economic function in branding Swaziland as a tourist destination. At the same time, I have argued that the ceremony is a distraction from the root causes of the social problems facing Swaziland. Perhaps surprisingly, the epidemic has not been ignored in the performance of Umhlanga, and in fact has increasingly become a central theme in the ceremony. However, by emphasizing abstinence and sexual morality, the performance shifts the blame away from the power structure and towards the girls themselves. Lastly, this research project has taught me, and can perhaps teach others, an important methodological lesson. Coming into this research with a very limited historical background, I expected to be able to rely on the Internet and research tools to find the information I needed. It was only after I had committed to the project, and the research question I was proposing, that I realized how limited my data was. Most of the student research at undergraduate institutions, particularly in the Social Sciences, occurs in the campus library, a space far removed from the field in which that primary research actually happens. As a consequence of this, research can become a cut and dry, depersonalized chore, and the real limitations of research are obscured. I have theorized that the reason why Umhlanga is so under-explored is because of the issue of access. Next year, I have the opportunity to conduct government-sponsored fieldwork in Swaziland, where I will be able to access data on Swaziland with much greater ease. With the frustrations I felt trying to gather data from a limited sample size, I am more grateful than ever for this opportunity. It will not be taken for granted. *Body of Power Spirit of Resistance: The University of Chicago Press. The Consequences of Modernity. Tourism and the less developed countries. Hobsbawm, E and Ranger, T.*

4: Monarchs of the World,

The German Empire consisted of 27 constituent states, most of them ruled by royal families. The constituent states retained their own governments, but had limited sovereignty. For example, both postage stamps and currency were issued for the German Empire as a whole. While the constituent states.

They tell us that all Kings are bad; that God never made a King; and that all Kings are very expensive. But, that all Kings are bad cannot be true: Jacques Benigne Bossuet , a well-known French Bishop and author, believed and espoused the concept of monarchy as a God given and a divine to benefit man. He quoted Ecclesiastics By me [that is, by God] princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: Because God honors them. And when Saul was made king at that time and given the charge to be the right kind of king, which he sincerely wanted to be, said in the presence of the prophet and the people, ". Or as John Calvin once stated, ". In other words, it was a rule that had checks and balances. It was designed to have important safeguards. Note the following commandment: And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: That his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left. Deuteronomy 17 In the Mishnah, we find Rabbi Simeon writing about things considered sacred to the Jews. The crown of Torah, the crown of priesthood, and the crown of royalty. The kings were to be followers of righteousness in their hearts or to the core of their being. Hence, the God of heaven made this extremely important obligation. His creation was not the right of an unlimited scepter of absolute power. Such was never at any time authorized in this divine institution of monarchy. In the community of Qumran about B. He had to consult the council on everything. He could not declare war without its consent. Ancient Records and Modern Perspectives, p. He explained that Moses prophesied, ". All of these things were to protect the people from abuse and ensure the best good and interests of society. It is doubtful that this order was followed, but it could have spared the people great difficulties and problems. It was a divinely approved system. However, and this is a major point, if democracy were indeed the best form of government as some suggest, was it not strange that the God of all the universe failed to discover it or share this so-called shining truth? In Biblical history there is no mention of it. But monarchy limited by an aristocracy and the consent of the people is mentioned. This mix of monarchy, aristocracy and representational government is considered to be the best that ever was or ever could be for mankind. Adam Clarke - , a widely respected and well known Biblical scholar, took forty years to create his exhaustive commentary. On the Samuel and kingship in Israel, he wrote that the children of Israel wanted an absolute king like the nations around them, but God in his wisdom gave them a the best kind of monarchy a monarchy that was supposed to be limited. Adam Clarke explained that the kingly government of God is "where the king, the nobles, and the people, are duly mixed, each having his proper part in the government, and each preventing the other from running to excess, and all limited by law. Checks and Balances" Adam Clarke elaborated: That the three grand forms of government which have obtained among mankind, viz. That, from a proper mixture of these, the advantages of the whole may be reaped without any of their attendant evils. In other words, if set up right, this kind of government works extremely well. It is also interesting that this type of government was considered the best that has ever existed by the wisest men who ever lived. They believed in it and taught it to others. A combination of the best that man has ever devised to promote freedom and prosperity" But before they ever lived and proclaimed this, it was what God wanted for ancient Israel. Adam Clarke concluded that this form of limited monarchy or ". The Old Testament Describes an Unending Dynasty Bishop Bossuet noted the special promises given to David and the royal dynasty God created for Israel anciently in his writings about divine rights. Elaborating on this important enterprise, we find in Psalms that it declares: In fact, so sure are these promises--that of royal kingship over the descendants of Jacob that the Lord, himself said, ". My covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for evermore, and his throne as the days of heaven. Nevertheless [in] my lovingkindness will I not. My covenant will I not

break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and [as] a faithful witness in heaven. Two lines of kings apparently spring up from the royal heritage of David. One has intermarried or mixed itself with all the royal families of Europe and the other is represented by the royal and imperial house of Ethiopia. In addition, Daniel, the prophet, while interpreting a dream the heavens gave to Nebuchadnezzar, said, "Thou, O king, art a king of kings: And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel; Behold I will send and take Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will set his throne upon these stones that I have hid; and he shall spread his royal pavilion over them. Thou, O king, art a king of kings: And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold. Paul wrote concerning Pharaoh, which by interpretation means king of the royal blood. He wrote the following of the Pharaoh of Egypt who lived during the days of Moses and declared: The whole point being that "the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it [these important earthly thrones] to whomsoever he will. In conclusion, as the scripture states, ". By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: He [God] removeth kings, and setteth up kings. Mankind has strayed from the divine creation. On this subject, a very appropriate point was made in the Gospel of Mark, which states, "What therefore God hath joined together [what God created], let not man put asunder. In other words, we should support, promote and encourage the kind of government, the Lord recommended to us the rule of constitutional monarchs. This is in our very best interests. That is, we can so very easily go counter to the will of heaven and set up inferior national governments republics that fail to bring out the very best in people. See " Ideals " and " Advantages " There is simply no better type of government than to have a royal king or prince, constitutionally bound, ruling for a more stable and a prosperous nation. International law and justice have recognized the right of true kings and princes or their successors to continue to rule, or to be restored to their ancient patrimony so they can preside as rightful heads of state. Nevertheless, monarchy must be limited and constitutional as shown in the type of system the Lord originally established in the House of Israel See " A Limited Monarchy was Instituted in Ancient Israel " It should be part of an elaborate system of checks and balances in order to protect what is a most sacred, precious treasure, that is, freedom and prosperity. This is what we advocate that there might be a brighter, healthier and happier future for all mankind in general. In other words, part of the curse of sin is to lose the great blessing and national benefit of having a royal family. Something for which one can feel favored or fortunate to have. If He desires their reform He sends them a reformer, and if He desires their destruction He sends them one who shall cause their perdition. In addition, a number of times prophecy has mentioned that there will be kingship in Islam. There shall be a tyrannical kingship mulkan jabriyyatan. There shall be kingship and tyranny. Monarchy has Obligations St. His final conclusion was ratified by Pope Pius VI - almost in the very same words. In writing after writing, before and since [Pope Pius VI], various Popes heaped praise on the institution [of monarchy], pointing out its roots in the Kingship of Christ Himself. No better modern witness to the Catholic view of Monarchy may be found than John Healy, Archbishop of Tuam at his death in The character of Kings is sacred: Coulombe, "The Monarchy in Australia"--see: Constitutional monarchy is a divine institution that has much to offer and benefit mankind. But undoubtedly the highest of all endorsements of monarchy is the fact that heaven itself is a monarchy. All monarchies, whether they attempt to or not, are, in one way or another, but a reflection of something that was created in heaven. It imitates the majesty and ideals of the kingship of God over all things. Thus divine graces or the virtues of heaven are consciously or unconsciously expected. For kings, in most cultures, were to be divine or godlike in character and represent deity. Failure to fulfill divine mandates for righteous behavior has resulted in disaster. Jeremiah, the prophet declared to one king: Hear the word of the LORD, O king of Judah, that sittest upon the throne of David, thou, and thy servants, and thy people that enter in by these gates: For if ye do this thing indeed, then shall there enter in by the gates of this house kings sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, he, and his servants, and his people. But if ye will not hear these words, I swear by myself, saith the LORD, that this house shall become a desolation. Maitland as "the crown and flower of English jurisprudence. The king has no equal within his realm.

5: Advantages and Disadvantages of Monarchy | OccupyTheory

As it concerns monarchy, those on the Allied side had survived but none were as secure as they were before World War I. In Britain, socialist agitation grew rapidly, particular in the trade unions and was one of the reasons, even before the war ended, of Britain refusing asylum to the Russian Imperial Family.

More recently, revisionist historians[who? He was the supreme judicial authority. He could condemn men to death without the right of appeal. It was both his duty to punish offenses and stop them from being committed. From his judicial authority followed his power both to make laws and to annul them. Most important was the abolition of the Council of the Realm. Prussia[edit] In Brandenburg-Prussia , the concept of absolute monarch took a notable turn from the above with its emphasis on the monarch as the "first servant of the state", but it also echoed many of the important characteristics of Absolutism. His actions largely originated the militaristic streak of the Hohenzollern. In the Diet of Brandenburg met for the last time and gave Frederick William the power to raise taxes without its consent, a strong indicator of absolutism. Frederick William enjoyed support from the nobles, who enabled the Great Elector to undermine the Diet and other representative assemblies. The leading families saw their future in cooperation with the central government and worked to establish absolutist power. The support of the Elector enabled the imposition of serfdom and the consolidation of land holdings into vast estates which provided for their wealth. They became known as Junkers from the German for young lord, junger Herr. Frederick William faced resistance from representative assemblies and long-independent cities in his realm. City leaders often revolted at the imposition of Electorate authority. Frederick William crushed this revolt in , by marching into the city with thousands of troops. A similar approach was used with the towns of Cleves. Peter I the Great reduced the power of the Russian nobility and strengthened the central power of the Tsars, establishing a bureaucracy and a police state. This tradition of absolutism, known as Tsarist autocracy , was expanded by Catherine II the Great and her descendants. Although Alexander II made some reforms and established an independent judicial system, Russia did not have a representative assembly or a constitution until the Revolution. However, the concept of absolutism was so ingrained in Russia that the Russian Constitution of still described the Tsar as an autocrat. Russia became the last European country excluding Vatican City to abolish absolutism, and it was the only one to do so as late as the 20th century the Ottoman Empire drafted its first constitution in Sweden[edit] The form of government instituted in Sweden under King Charles XI and passed on to his son, Charles XII is commonly referred to as absolute monarchy; however, the Swedish monarch was never absolute in the sense that he wielded arbitrary power. The absolute rule of Charles XI was instituted by the crown and the Riksdag in order to carry out the Great Reduction which would have been made impossible by the privy council which comprised the high nobility. After the death of Charles XII in , the system of absolute rule was largely blamed for the ruination of the realm in the Great Northern War , and the reaction tipped the balance of power to the other extreme end of the spectrum, ushering in the Age of Liberty. The years between and , then, are also referred to as a period of absolute monarchy. This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. May Learn how and when to remove this template message The popularity of the notion of absolute monarchy declined substantially after the American Revolution and the French Revolution , which promoted theories of government based on popular sovereignty. In Bhutan , the government moved from absolute monarchy to constitutional monarchy following planned parliamentary elections to the Tshogdu in , and the election of a National Assembly in Nepal had several swings between constitutional rule and direct rule related to the Nepalese Civil War , the Maoist insurgency , and the Nepalese royal massacre , with the Nepalese monarchy being abolished on May 28, In Tonga , the King had majority control of the Legislative Assembly until On the other hand, Liechtenstein has moved towards expanding the power of the monarch:

6: The Mad Monarchist: Impact of the Great War & Loss of Monarchy

Absolute monarchy is a form of monarchy in which one leader has supreme authority and where that authority is not restricted by any written laws, legislature, or customs. These are often, but not always, hereditary monarchies.

Of Monarchy and Hereditary Succession Summary Paine asserts that mankind was originally in a state of equality, and, therefore, present inequalities must have been brought about by some circumstance. Paine says that a common distinction that lacks any natural or religious basis, is the division between kings and their subjects. This distinction, unlike those between male and female or good and evil, is not one "of heaven," and Paine wishes to inquire into its origin and its consequences. Originally, Paine says, there were no kings in the world. Then, the ancient Jews copied the custom from the "heathens" who surrounded them. This was a grave mistake, and Paine maintains that in establishing a king for themselves, the Jews sinned. Man is supposed to have only God ruling over him, and to introduce a king, who in ruling over the people is like a God, is a grave misdeed. Eventually, Paine says, the Jewish people asked the prophet Samuel for a king. Samuel attempted dissuade the people, but they insisted that they wanted to have a King like the other nations, and God assented, even though he thought it evil that the people should want someone other than God to rule over them. Having considered the biblical origin of monarchy, Paine concludes that it is a practice begun in sinfulness. The many pages of scriptural evidence make it clear that God stands in opposition to monarchy. Paine moves on to attack the notion of the hereditary succession of the monarchy. Paine argues that, since all men are born equal, no man could have the right to establish his family as forever presiding over others. Even if a person deserves certain honors, his children may not deserve them, and that person has no right to pass those honors on. Paine also observes that the recent kings of England have mostly been bad, which he says should indicate, even to those who favor hereditary succession, that the present line of kings does not exercise legitimate power. Paine wonders where the power of kings originally comes from, and decides that this power is always based on one of three things: Paine says that if a king is chosen by election, this means all future kings should be chosen in the same way, and if the king usurped his throne, then the entire reign is illegitimate. Any way you look at it, hereditary succession is not valid. Paine adds that hereditary succession brings other evils with it. For example, people who see themselves as born into an elite existence are often "ignorant and unfit. Monarchy and hereditary succession, Paine concludes have produced nothing in the world but bad governance and bloodshed. Paine tries to undercut this line of thinking by attacking it on its own terms, and presenting Biblical passages that reject the idea of a divinely appointed monarchy. In this case, Paine presents an arsenal of Biblical evidence to show that monarchy is neither a natural nor a preferable institution.

7: Constitutional Monarchy Association

But the longest-reigning monarch is hardly the only one out there in the world – in fact, there are 29 modern monarchies, reigning over 40 countries. Some, like King Salam bin Abdulaziz Al Saud.

Use the following to spice up an argument or garnish a school essay. Jan Christian Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa I am a true servant of my King and country, not only as a dutiful subject but because I am a convinced monarchist, politically and intellectually. I mean by that, quite apart from myself and my relationship to my Bavarian and German fatherland, I believe monarchy to be the most successful form of government that the history of mankind has known. Adolf von Harnier, on trial for treason, Germany If the Allies at the peace table at Versailles had allowed a Hohenzollern, a Wittelsbach and a Habsburg to return to their thrones, there would have been no Hitler. A democratic basis of society might have been preserved by a crowned Weimar in contact with the victorious Allies. The Italians are individualists and a republic will become the cause of confusion and disorder. I have no doubt of it. When all this comes to pass who will profit from it? Our respect for him as an inspirational force was equalled by our affection for him as a gentle human being. General Dwight D Eisenhower, 7th February Impartiality and continuity are important aspects of government, and it is doubtful whether any form of democratic government yet discovered provides these to any greater extent than does constitutional monarchy Sydney D Bailey, British Parliamentary Democracy, Harrap, This war would never have come unless, under American and modernising pressure, we had driven the Habsburgs out of Austria and the Hohenzollerns out of Germany. By making these vacuums we gave the opening for the Hitlerite monster to crawl out of its sewer on to the vacant thrones. No doubt these views are very unfashionable Jack Lang, French Minister of Culture, October If constitutional monarchy were to come to an end in Britain, parliamentary democracy would probably not survive it. It is, after all, through the monarchy that parliamentary control over the armed forces is mediated and maintained. His demeanour is a perfect illustration of the benefits of a constitutional monarchy. We would do well to heed it. The alternative nightmare scenario looks not to the European model but to the American, where the essentials for election to the presidency appear to be ruthless ambition, access to vast wealth, reckless promises of patronage and preferment, effective control of a big slice of the media and a plausible TV manner. Gordon Medcalf, The Independent, 10th September The Queen Mother is one who knows how to be Queen, how to preserve mystery and yet be accessible, one who knows how to epitomise the higher aspirations of a people, yet retain both humanity and humour. Sir Roy Strong, January I write by the light of two eternal truths: Honore de Balzac, Monarchy is the one system of government where power is exercised for the good of all. He is endowed with every kingly quality; he is courageous, generous, and magnanimous; he has a fine intellect and a well-balanced mind; and his name bears the tradition of a thousand years of history. Who better than he to symbolise the unity of the country, and act as supreme moderator in party strife? By every means in their power they tried to win his support, now begging him not to allow fellow Etruscans, men of the same blood as himself, to continue living in penniless exile, now warning him of the dangerous consequences of letting republicanism go unavenged. The expulsion of kings they urged, once it had begun, might well become common practice; liberty was an attractive idea, and unless reigning monarchs defended their thrones as vigorously as states now seemed to be trying to destroy them, all order and subordination would collapse; nothing would be left in any country but flat equality; greatness and eminence would be gone for ever. Monarchy, the noblest thing in heaven or on earth, was nearing its end. Livy, The History of Rome from its Foundation, Book II Those who imagine that a politician would make a better figurehead than a hereditary monarch might perhaps make the acquaintance of more politicians. Baroness Thatcher, November Thus the young royals are reproached for setting a bad example and failing to keep their marriages together by journalists who themselves lead Casanova-like lives. For the vast majority of Canadians, being a Monarchy is probably the only form of government acceptable to them. I have always been for parliamentary democracy and I think the institution of Monarchy with the Queen heading it all has served Canada well. Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, If to be a Republican is to hold, as a matter of theory at least, that is the best

government for a free and intelligent people in which merit is to be preferred to birth, then I hold it an honour to be associated with nearly all the greatest thinkers of the country and to be a Republican. But if a Republican is one who would thrust aside the opinion and affront the sentiment of a huge majority of the nation, merely to carry to a logical conclusion an abstract theory, then I am far from being a Republican as any man can be. Rt Hon Joseph Chamberlain in The State functions more easily if it can be personified. An elected President who has stepped out of politics, like the French President, is no substitute for a King who has stepped in by right of inheritance. Still less is an active politician, like the President of the United States, a substitute. We can damn the Government and cheer the King. Integrity and continuity are their stock in trade. These qualities are becoming more precious when European political parties, many of them in power for a decade or more, are increasingly judged arrogant or corrupt or both. Politicians could with profit learn not to treat modesty as merely a royal prerogative. HM King Simeon II of the Bulgarians, October The monarchy is a political referee, not a political player, and there is a lot of sense in choosing the referee by a different principle from the players. It lessens the danger that the referee might try to start playing. Earl Russell, The Spectator, 11th January Monarchy is first proved to be the true and rightful form of government. And as he is the image of the divine unity, so man is through him made one, and brought most near to God. Justice is best secured by a supreme arbiter of disputes, himself untempted by ambition, since his dominion is already bounded only by ocean. To this noblest end does the monarch and he alone guide us; other forms of government are perverted, and exist for the benefit of some class; he seeks the good of all alike, being to that very end appointed. It exists in the interests of the people. Robert Harris, Mail on Sunday, 7th September For any country it is better to have a monarch than an elected president of the republic Elections are all very well for the designation of the prime minister or of the party which should take power, but not for the Head of State, who should be above party. Unlike a president in all probability the monarch who succeeds to the throne has been trained for this exalted post by having spent many years by the side of his predecessor. A monarch, however, cannot declare that he is ready to throw in his hand. The personal conveniences of sovereigns are of little importance. What is important is that Great Britain needs them. George Brown Foreign Secretary in the Wilson government , Daily Mail, November Monarchy can easily be debunked, but watch the faces, mark well the debunkers. These are the men whose taproot in Eden has been cut: Yet even if they desire mere equality they cannot reach it. Where men are forbidden to honour a king they honour millionaires, athletes or film stars instead: For spiritual nature, like bodily nature, will be served; deny it food and it will gobble poison. The Guardian, 22nd March A priest who is not a monarchist is not worthy to stand at the altar table. The priest who is a republican is always a man of poor faith. God himself anoints the monarch to be head of the kingdom, while the president is elected by the pride of the people. The king brings his faithful subjects to God, while the president takes them away from God. Neomartyr Vladimir, Metropolitan of Kiev, tortured and killed by Bolsheviks on 7th February The Queen was helpful, lively, fascinating to talk to, and very, very funny. The idea that she is out of touch is nonsense. It is hated in all the gutters of the world. The reason is simple. It enshrines with a fitting dignity and elaboration the principle of authority as something independent of this or that politician. It places it above attack. It symbolises and consecrates an attitude of mind essential to the happiness of peoples. The best governments are constitutional monarchies, and we may yet see some restored in eastern Europe. Lord Menuhin, The Daily Telegraph, 2nd July In republics there is not a respect for authority, but a fear of power. The mass of mankind understand it, and they hardly anywhere in the world understand any other. Walter Bagehot, The English Constitution, I think the family has got to streamline itself but the core members have a brand personality that a business would die for. Jack Stevens, advertising agent, The Independent, 30th June Above the ebb and flow of party strife, the rise and fall of ministries, and individuals, the changes of public opinion or public fortune, the British Monarchy presides, ancient, calm and supreme within its function, over all the treasures that have been saved from the past and all the glories we write in the annals of our country. Sir Winston Churchill To be a king and wear a crown is more glorious to them that see it than it is a pleasure to them that bear it. Queen Elizabeth I Parliaments and Ministers pass, but she abides in lifelong duty, and she is to them as the oak in the forest is to the annual harvest in the field. William Gladstone, writing about Queen Victoria Russia under Nicholas II, with all the survivals of feudalism, had opposition political parties,

independent trade unions and newspapers, a rather radical parliament and a modern legal system. Its agriculture was on the level of the USA, with industry rapidly approaching the West European level. In the USSR there was total tyranny, no political liberties and practically no human rights. Its economy was not viable; agriculture was destroyed. The terror against the population reached a scope unprecedented in history. No wonder many Russians look back at Tsarist Russia as a paradise lost. Oleg Gordievsky, letter to *The Independent*, 21st July Americans also seem to believe that the monarchy is a kind of mediaeval hangover, encumbered by premodern notions of decorum; the reality is that the British monarchy, for good or ill, is a modern political institution - perhaps the first modern political institution. Adam Gopnik, *The New Yorker*, September 29th There is nothing about which I am more anxious than my country, and for its sake I am willing to die ten deaths, if that be possible. I have always tried to be tolerant and to respect and treat with consideration all kinds of religious beliefs. In this respect the ruler must not permit any discrimination. During my long reign in Bulgaria there was no persecution of those belonging to another faith, of Mohammedans or Jews. Had there been any I would have punished those responsible with the greatest severity. General de Gaulle in a speech addressed to Queen Elizabeth II We should all bear carefully in mind the constitutional safeguards inherent in the monarchy: While The Queen occupies the highest office of state, no one can take over the government. While she is head of the law, no politician can take over the courts. While she is ultimately in command of the Armed Forces, no would-be dictator can take over the Army. Any attempt to tamper with the royal prerogative must be firmly resisted. There is also something re-assuring in the knowledge that every Prime Minister, every week, has a confidential and not necessarily comfortable conversation with a monarch: This sense of continuity, of a nation mature enough to be able to make electoral mistakes and later recant without risk of losing its identity, is profoundly useful. Libby Purves, *The Times*, 8th September A Republic of Great Britain Bill would dominate the lifetime of a parliament to the detriment of all other economic and social affairs, and if passed would change virtually every facet of British life beyond recognition. From postage stamps to the names of warships, every area of political, social, economic, financial, religious and civil life would be transformed, and potentially unleash political forces beyond our control or comprehension. In the present generation it has acquired a meaning incomparably more powerful than anyone had dreamed possible in former times. The Crown has become the mysterious link, may I say the magic link, which unites our loosely bound but strongly interwoven Commonwealth of Nations, states and races. People who would never tolerate the assertions of a written Constitution which implies any diminution of their independence are the foremost to be proud of their loyalty to the Crown. Editorial, *The Daily Telegraph*, July Royalty is a Government in which the attention of the nation is concentrated on one person doing interesting actions.

8: King John: the most evil monarch in Britain's history - Telegraph

A monarchy is a form of government in which a group, generally a group of people representing a dynasty (aristocracy), embodies the country's national identity and its head, the monarch, exercises the role of sovereignty.

Contact Constitutional Monarchy A constitutional monarchy is a form of government in which a monarch acts as head of state within the parameters of a written i. It differs from absolute monarchy in that an absolute monarch serves as the sole source of political power in the state and is not legally bound by any constitution. Most constitutional monarchies employ a parliamentary system in which the Monarch may have strictly Ceremonial duties or may have Reserve Powers, depending on the constitution. They have a directly or indirectly elected prime minister who is the head of government, and exercises effective political power. Today constitutional monarchy is almost always combined with representative democracy, and represents as a theory of civics a compromise between total trust in the political class, and in well-bred and well-trained monarchs raised for the role from birth. Examples include the attempted F coup in Spain in , the and coup attempts in Thailand, and the attempted communist takeover in Grenada in In the Spanish and Thai cases action taken by the king proved decisive; in the case of Grenada the call for outside assistance was made by the Governor-General Sir Paul Scoon. Today constitutional monarchy is almost always combined with representative democracy, and represents as a theory of civics a compromise between total trust in the electorate, and in well-bred and well-trained monarchs raised for the role from birth. Today the monarchy in Britain is politically neutral and by convention the role is largely ceremonial. No person may accept significant public office without swearing an oath of allegiance to the Queen. Constitutional monarchy most notably occurred in continental Europe after the French Revolution. Napoleon Bonaparte is considered to be "the first monarch" proclaiming himself as embodiment of the nation, rather than as a divinely-appointed ruler in contrast the Divine Right of French Kings before him; this interpretation of monarchy is basic to continental constitutional monarchies. Hegel, in Philosophy of Right justified it philosophically, according it well with evolving contemporary political theory, and with the Protestant Christian view of Natural Law. Hegel forecast a constitutional monarch of limited powers, whose function is embodying the national character and constitutional continuity in emergencies, per the development of constitutional monarchy in Europe and Japan. Moreover, the ceremonial office of president e. The Russian and French presidents, with their stronger powers, might be Hegelian, wielding power suited to the national will embodied. Modern Constitutional Monarchy As originally conceived, a constitutional monarch was quite a powerful figure, head of the executive branch even though his or her power was limited by the constitution and the elected parliament. The present concept of constitutional monarchy developed in the United Kingdom, where it was the democratically elected parliaments, and their leader, the prime minister, who had become those who exercised power, with the monarchs voluntarily ceding it and contenting themselves with the titular position. In many cases even the monarchs themselves, while still at the very top of the political and social hierarchy, were given the status of "servants of the people" to reflect the new, egalitarian view. In the kind of constitutional monarchy established under the Constitution of the German Empire which Bismarck inspired, the Kaiser retained considerable actual executive power, and the Prime Minister needed no parliamentary vote of confidence and ruled solely by the imperial mandate. Later on, Fascist Italy could also be considered as a "constitutional monarchy" of a kind, in the sense that there was a king as the titular head of state while actual power was held by Benito Mussolini under a constitution. This eventually discredited the Italian monarchy and led to its abolition in After the Second World War, surviving European monarchies almost invariably adopted some variant of the constitutional monarchy model originally developed in Britain. In present terms, the difference between a parliamentary democracy that is a constitutional monarchy and one that is a republic, is considered more a difference of detail than of substance. In both cases, the titular head of state - monarch or president - serves the traditional role of embodying and representing the nation, while the actual governing is carried out by an elected Prime Minister. This is contradictory to the Republican cause and desire to abolish the role of the Monarch, to replace it with another individual to assume the same duties. However, the two most populous

constitutional monarchies in the world are in Asia: In such cases it is the prime minister who holds the day-to-day powers of governance, while the King or Queen or other monarch, such as a Grand Duke, in the case of Luxembourg, or Prince in the case of Monaco and Liechtenstein retains only residual but not always minor powers. Different nations grant different powers to their monarchs. In the Netherlands, Denmark and in Belgium, for example, the Monarch formally appoints a representative to preside over the creation of a coalition government following a parliamentary election, while in Norway the King chairs special meetings of the cabinet. In nearly all cases, the monarch is still the nominal chief executive, but is bound by constitutional convention to act on the advice of the Cabinet. Only a few monarchies most notably Japan and Sweden have amended their constitutions so that the monarch is no longer even the nominal chief executive. The most significant family of constitutional monarchies in the world today are the sixteen Commonwealth realms under our Queen, Elizabeth II. Unlike some of their continental European counterparts, the Monarch and her Governors-General in the Commonwealth realms hold significant "reserve" or "prerogative" powers, to be wielded in times of extreme emergency or constitutional crises usually to uphold parliamentary government. An instance of a Governor General exercising his power was during the Australian constitutional crisis, when the Australian Prime Minister of the time, Gough Whitlam, was dismissed by the Governor-General. On 11 November, Whitlam intended to call a half-Senate election in an attempt to break the deadlock. Acting quickly before all parliamentarians became aware of the change of government, Fraser and his allies were able to secure passage of the appropriation bills, and the Governor-General dissolved Parliament for a double dissolution election. Fraser and his government were returned with a massive majority. Among supporters of constitutional monarchy however, the experience confirmed the value of the monarchy as a source of checks and balances against elected politicians who might seek powers in excess of those conferred by their respective constitutions, and ultimately as a safeguard against dictatorship. Bhumibol has reigned through several political changes in the Thai government. He has played an influential role in each incident, oftentimes acting as mediator between disputing political opponents. Generally, the Thai people are reverent of Bhumibol. Much of his social influence comes from that and the fact that the royal family is often involved in socio-economic improvement efforts. In both the United Kingdom and elsewhere, a common debate centres around when it is appropriate for a monarch to use his or her political powers. When a monarch does act, political controversy can often ensue, partially because the neutrality of the crown is seen to be compromised in favour of a partisan goal. While political scientists may champion the idea of an "interventionist monarch" as a check against possible illegal action by politicians, the monarchs themselves are often driven by a more pragmatic sense of self-preservation, in which avoiding political controversy can be seen as an important way to retain public legitimacy and popularity. There also exist today several federal constitutional monarchies. In these countries, each subdivision has a distinct government and head of government, but all subdivisions share a monarch who is head of state of the federation as a united whole. The latest country that was completely transformed from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional democratic monarchy is Bhutan. Monarchists argue that Constitutional Monarchy possesses two central features that rarely are to be found in presidents; while presidents may see themselves in terms of a limited term of office, with them often being "retired" from other posts into the presidency, constitutional monarchy tends to involve a professional life-long commitment. The other often cited advantage is that monarchs do not represent specific political views, and that they provide stability or act as a symbol of the state or nation. The very fact that a monarch has a lifelong professional job does mean that an experienced monarch has a wealth of knowledge that governments find invaluable, although of course most monarchs do not last that long. These are generally things which remain within the Royal Prerogative. These powers are diverse: However, such activities are not generally done by her directly and were the Queen to carry out these functions independent of Parliament she would precipitate a constitutional crisis. In addition, historically it has been held that the Queen cannot be prosecuted for any criminal offence or be required to give testimony in court. Queen Elizabeth II meets her prime minister every Tuesday evening for a confidential audience, at which she and her prime minister discuss matters of state. The longer a reign, the greater the degree of experience a monarch has, particularly as she receives copies of all state documentation, all cabinet memoranda, reports from British ambassadors worldwide, security service intelligence, etc. Sir

John Peck, on being appointed British ambassador to Senegal, said that when Kissing Hands the formal name of the appointment procedure he received a more perceptive analysis of African and Senegalese politics from Queen Elizabeth than from any government official, based on her personal experiences on state visits, briefing documents and knowledge of African leaders, experiences that desk-bound officials, no matter how theoretically knowledgeable, had never had. The Labour cabinet saw the scale of the movement as too insignificant to warrant further exploration. However Queen Elizabeth, who had ten years continuous experience of the Rhodesian issue unlike the ministers who had only a relatively small degree of experience, having only come to power in the early s , observed how any sign of movement was a change from the lack of movement present previously. The Labour ministers paid heed to her privately expressed observation that followed a conversation she had had with James Callaghan at a state banquet for the Italian president and maintained the initial contacts. These contacts over a number of years finally led to the Lancaster House conference that established Zimbabwe. In early , as the Labour government of Tony Blair pondered whether to enter into a war with Saddam Hussein, Queen Elizabeth was the only senior governmental figure still in office who had had experience of the Suez Crisis in the late s, and who as a result could mention to Blair observations on the nature of the Suez debacle and lessons to be learned from it, in deciding on whether to go to war with Saddam. It is not known what comments Queen Elizabeth made to the Prime Minister, but few doubted but that she would give the benefit of her observations having been monarch at the time, she had had access to all the then government documentation and memoranda, as well as having been a confidante of the then Prime Minister Anthony Eden and his cabinet and that the Prime Minister would take her observations very seriously.

9: MONARCHY AND NOBILITY: DIVINE RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES

The monarch's symbolic role within that association of a quarter of the world states will be reduced. There is too the role of the royal family. Public opinion shows little support for the wider.

Europe, to We know a great deal about the monarchs of early modern Europe, but we know much less about monarchy, that is, the institution of personal rulership. Until the French Revolution, monarchy was usually taken for granted by Europeans. Since it was endorsed by the Bible and Aristotle, the touchstones of written truth, few thought to analyze it further. Those who did, like Jean Bodin or Thomas Hobbes, were viewed with suspicion by more cautious minds. The adjectives that we employ today to describe types of monarchy, such as "absolutist," "divine right," or "constitutional," were not used in a systematic way before the eighteenth century because they were not greatly needed. While they may be quite useful in understanding early modern monarchy, it would be a mistake to apply them too rigorously, as if monarchs adhered to them as underlying principles. Institutions that everyone takes for granted tend to be conservative, and this was certainly the case with monarchy. It generally fostered a distrust of political change. Yet monarchs could sponsor the most daring innovations, which became more acceptable because of their support. Indeed, perhaps the most remarkable feature of early modern European monarchy was its recurring dynamism, its ability to create or adapt to new circumstances. Unlike its counterparts in many other parts of the world, European kingship between and was constantly changing in response to competition or crisis. By the eighteenth century, European monarchs possessed more effective means of communication and control than their rivals elsewhere, combined with better military technology. These advantages encouraged them to impose themselves on other parts of the world. Their systems of governance may not have been superior, but their organization was, however haphazard it may seem to us today. Thus, the transformation of rulership in early modern Europe had global consequences. While this may be a reasonable overall description, it does not fit most early modern European monarchies very precisely, because they were so diverse. To begin with, few of them were simple political entities. Most were composite states, amalgamations of regions, provinces, or even kingdoms, whose chief or only point of unity was the person of the monarch. Spain after was not a single administrative unit; rather, it was a collection of separate kingdoms united only by allegiance to a single ruler. The same was true of Great Britain between and Today, national states are held together by identities based on common values and impersonal institutions. It is hard for us to imagine a political body that would dissolve if a single office were vacant, but that was the case with most early modern monarchies. This in turn complicated the meaning of rulership, which might relate to little more than the existence of a monarch at the head of a realm. The day-to-day direction of the polity might rest in the hands of the king only in an abstract sense. He was, to be sure, the ultimate source of authority in the kingdom. Yet nowhere did he make every political decision, either alone or in his council; and nowhere was his power unrestricted. Customs, privileges, traditions, laws, Estates, assemblies, and parliaments—all put boundaries on royal power, sometimes so severely that the king was able to do very little on his own. Besides, in the "age of the favorite," kings were often happy to delegate power to a leading minister, such as Olivares in Spain, Richelieu in France, Buckingham in England, Oxenstierna in Sweden, and Griffenfeld in Denmark. Personal rulership was in flux during the early modern period. It was traditionally understood to mean two things above all: Both roles had seriously decayed by the mid-1700s. Medieval kings regularly led troops into battle and were eager to intervene in strategic decisions during wartime. This began to change with the expansion of armies in the 16th century, and by the 17th century, generals and military experts were firmly in charge. Kings stopped regularly dispensing personal justice in the late Middle Ages and rarely exercised direct supervision of judicial systems, although they continued to use pardons as a means of exhibiting their final say over the law. Taxation became the most important practical function of government. Those who resisted taxes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries liked to claim that the ruler was ignorant of the tyranny and corruption of his officers "if the king only knew. The rumor that Louis XVI ruled "à l'aveugle" was involved in a pacte de famine against his own people was a crucial factor in the erosion of his rulership over France. In some eyes, the warrior leader and font of justice had become little more than a chief bureaucrat.

Was monarchy always strictly hereditary? Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, and the Holy Roman Empire were elected monarchies, and nobles in other countries, notably Muscovy, Denmark, and Sweden, could fall back on the elective principle in times of crisis. The only nation where hereditary right was fixed in law was France, which was why some observers, like Claude de Seyssel, thought the French monarchy was more stable than any other. Yet in spite of its supposed virtues, the Salic Law, invented to keep English claimants off the French throne by ruling out inheritance in the female line, was not imitated in the rest of Europe. The English determined their own succession by armed struggle in 1066, 1215, and 1327, by usurpation in 1399, by the novel principle of female inheritance in 1554, and by parliamentary statute in 1701. The Swedes, whose Vasa kings were viewed as mere usurpers by their former Danish overlords, thrice chose a king by legislative approval. The Spanish royal inheritance of 1700 was dictated by the testament of Charles II, not by lineage alone. The Ottoman succession was never secure. Did a king rule for life? Charles I of England was tried and executed in 1649; his son James II was deposed in 1688, although Parliament declared it an abdication. Queen Christina of Sweden really did abdicate in 1654, but she expected to be treated with royal dignity for the rest of her life. Philip V took the unprecedented step of first abdicating in 1700, then reclaiming the Spanish throne after the premature death of his son, Luis. Ottoman sultans could not abdicate, but they were regularly murdered, particularly by rebellious Janissaries. Not all kings were crowned. The Ottoman Empire lacked a coronation ceremony, as did Castile; in both cases, the ruler was simply proclaimed, and banners unfurled. Elsewhere, the coronation ceremony was carefully observed, but the ordinances or rules that governed the ritual were always subject to revision. The church had at first resisted the idea that coronation made the king into a holy figure, like a priest. By the early modern period, however, the clergy had given way to royal assertiveness. It conferred an aura of sacredness on the royal person. Yet in hereditary monarchies, coronation did not initiate rulership, which began at the death of the preceding monarch. This contradiction was often noted, never resolved. In the eighteenth century, the legitimizing power of the coronation declined throughout Europe, and it became simply another occasion for display and pomp. While coronation ceremonies usually retained some form of popular acclamation, they tended to reinforce the idea that early modern kings ruled by the will of God rather than that of the people. This was a consistent message, even in Poland, where the king was elected by the nobles and was frequently bullied by them. In practice, however, the will of God could be narrowly interpreted, as the Providence that maintained the king on the throne and gave him victories. It might also extend to acts of the king that directly invoked the deity, like the miracle of the royal touch in England and France; but when the king laid hands on sufferers to cure scrofula, it was God, not he, who performed the healing. Divine sanction did not mean that the king was a saint although Russian tsars, Louis XIII of France, and the martyred Charles I of England were represented in that way, or that specific acts of royal governance expressed the intentions of the Almighty. It was often the opponents of monarchs, from the French Catholic League to Belgian patriots of the 17th century, who were most strident in appropriating heavenly favor for their political actions. Even the Ottoman sultan was circumspect in his use of the title "caliph" or heir to the prophet. Monarchs gradually became bolder in asserting control over the clergy and religion. This did not make them more sacred, but it did make them controversial. The attack against Jansenism that was initiated by Louis XIV and continued by his successor created a political furor that lasted sixty years. The most daring offender against religious sensibilities may have been Emperor Joseph II, who dissolved monasteries, gave toleration to Jews, and aroused bitter clerical opposition. As a result, traditionalist church parties formed throughout Europe. What they had in common was disillusionment with monarchy, causing a distrust that could feed into revolutionary sympathies after 1789. Inspired by the ancients, political philosophers usually wanted to write for the ages, not to address specific institutional questions. While they were deeply influenced by what was happening around them, they consciously sought to separate their writings from contemporary circumstances. The impact of their theories, however, was seldom what they had expected. The main classical sources for European political theory were Roman law, Aristotle, often filtered through Cicero, and the Roman historian Tacitus. Roman law dealt directly with the question of imperium, which could be understood variously, as absolute sovereignty the emperor was above the laws or as some sort of limited rulership the emperor was bound by the laws. The civil lawyers often regarded imperium as meaning both simultaneously: This was the point of view of leading imperial jurists, like Dietrich Reinking.

As a result, sovereign authority was held by German territorial rulers, not the emperor. The empire survived, however, and by the eighteenth century, constitutional equilibrium rather than imperium was the main concern of its civil lawyers. The impact of Aristotle was more pervasive and subtle. His emphasis on personal balance and selfrestraint informed countless manuals on lordly behavior, or "Mirrors for Princes. The reading of Aristotle and Cicero inspired an abhorrence of despotism and a belief in the public good as the ultimate end of government. Since most of them were priests, they also stressed the supremacy of the church over any secular monarchy. Protestant Aristotelians like Martin Luther himself and Henning Arnisaeus accepted the primacy of religion but were more willing to separate monarchy from popular approval. The third classical strain in early modern European political thought was derived from the historian Tacitus, who excoriated the corruption and decrepitude of the Roman imperial state. Admirers of Tacitus were not always critical of monarchy; like Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke, in the eighteenth century, they might believe that only a strong, heroic ruler could restore decayed virtue. The classical tradition gave only limited sustenance to those political writers who wanted a more "absolute" monarchy. In fact, Aristotle and Cicero could be read as consistent with an interpretation of the Bible that saw kings as responsible to the people rather than directly to God. They vested ultimate authority in the magistrates, in legislatures, or in the people rather than the king. Buchanan, like Mariana, even allowed that open resistance to a tyrant might be legitimate. Where could defenders of a stronger monarchy turn? To the Bible, of course, and to Roman history. For the French lawyer Jean Bodin, the sovereignty of a monarch could not be divided, shared, or legally resisted because it rested on the patriarchal power exercised by an all-powerful God as well as by ancient Roman fathers. The Englishman Robert Filmer carried Bodin a stage further by making patriarchal power "arbitrary," so that the father-ruler could do whatever he wanted, without any right of resistance.

My mom is different European Pancreatic Club Epc, 21st Meeting, Glasgow, September 1989 (Digestion)
Another roadside attraction by tom robbins Doctrines of Shi`i Islam Learning the vi and vim editor
Discovering gifts in middle school Buying, selling, and renting merchandise and equipment Accelerating
financial market restructuring in China Deepak Bhattasali Petersons 21st Century Manager Italy, handbook for
travellers Basics of angularjs 2 Heterodoxy in natural philosophy and medicine : Pietro Pomponazzi,
Guglielmo Gratarolo, Girolamo Cardano Baby Toddler Cookbook Sabretooth unleashed Gods Justice:
Activity Book (Story Bible Activity Series: No.6) 17 Chief of Defence Staff, 1979-1982 Parental involvement
tools for teachers Pattern Recognition, 1994 International Conference on (12th Icpr Vol. 3 Veterinary
medicine and animal care careers Education of the hero in Arthurian romance. Outlook 2013 tasks tutorial
Beaux arts to Bauhaus and beyond The PIE project : an introduction (short paper Pierre-Yves Cunin Guiding
Those Left Behind in Minnesota (Guiding Those Left Behind In.) Imam Muhammad Sayyed Tantawi, Sheikh
of Al-azhar International handbook of underwater archaeology Emergency Workout Fate, Logic, and Time
Partial list of NACA/NASA Lewis research reports on rocket engines. Lets Learn to Write Script (A
Wipe-It-Off Practice Book) Rebellion in the veins Kids taking charge Orbital dystopia Raposo, Bradley Addie
instructional design process Surfing fundamentals The broken wings by kahlil gibran Globalization and the
South : Memphis and the paradoxes of place Golf, gambling, and gamesmanship A pictures worth a thousand
words The adventures of Theagenes and Chariclia