

PECULIARITIES AND VARIETIES OF THE INSTITUTION OF MONARCHY AND COMPARISON OF THE POWERS OF MONARCHS IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

The article examines the peculiarities and varieties of the institution of monarchy, as well as offers a comparative analysis of the powers of formal and informal authority of monarchs in European countries. On this basis, it was checked whether the power of monarchs is a factor in the success and prosperity of monarchies. The author stated that there is no really strong monarch on the territory of Europe at the present stage, and almost all the countries considered are constitutional monarchies, where a monarch and his or her actions are significantly limited by constitution, traditions, laws, government and parliament. This is due to the fact that the heads of state in the democratic countries of Europe govern, but do not rule and do not manage, as well as instead perform nominal and symbolic roles. Oddly enough, this is one of the reasons for the success and prosperity of monarchies, although the hypothesis that the power of monarchs correlates with the development results and prosperity rating of certain states has not been directly proven.

Keywords: monarchy, monarch, powers, the head of state, European countries.

OSOBLIWOŚCI I ODMIANY INSTYTUCJI MONARCHII ORAZ PORÓWNANIE UPRAWNIEN MONARCHÓW W KRAJACH EUROPEJSKICH.

W artykule zbadano osobliwości i odmiany instytucji monarchii, a także zaproponowano analizę porównawczą uprawnień formalnej i nieformalnej władzy monarchów w państwach europejskich. Na tej podstawie zbadano, czy władza monarchów jest czynnikiem decydującym o sukcesie i pomyślności monarchii. Autor stwierdza, że na obecnym etapie na terytorium Europy nie ma prawdziwie silnego monarchy, a prawie wszystkie rozpatrywane państwa są monarchiami konstytucyjnymi, w których monarcha i jego działania są znacznie ograniczone przez konstytucję, tradycje, prawa, rząd i parlament. Wynika to z faktu, że głowy państw w demokratycznych krajach Europy władają, ale nie rządzą i nie zarządzają, zamiast tego zaś pełnią role nominalne i symboliczne. Co może być zaskakujące, jest to jedna z przyczyn sukcesu i dobrobytu monarchii, choć hipoteza, że władza monarchów koreluje z wynikami rozwoju i rankingiem dobrobytu określonych państw, nie została bezpośrednio udowodniona.

Słowa kluczowe: monarchia, monarcha, uprawnienia, głowa państwa, państwa europejskie.

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ Й РІЗНОВИДИ ІНСТИТУТУ МОНАРХІЇ ТА ПОРІВНЯННЯ УПОВНОВАЖЕНОСТІ МОНАРХІВ В КРАЇНАХ ЄВРОПИ

У статті розглянуто особливості й різновиди інституту монархії, а також запропоновано порівняльний аналіз сили формальної та неформальної уповноваженості монархів у країнах Європи. На цій підставі перевірено, чи сила монархів є чинником успішності та процвітання монархій. Констатовано, що на сучасному етапі на теренах Європи немає дійсно сильного монарха, а майже всі розглянуті країни є конституційними монархіями, в яких монарх і його дії суттєво обмежені конституцією, традиціями, законами, урядом, парламентом. Це зумовлено і тим, що глави держав у демократичних країнах Європи панують, однак не правлять та не управляють, а натомість виконують номінальні та символічні ролі. Як не дивно, в цьому одна з причин успіху та процвітання монархій, хоча, на противагу, прямо не доведено гіпотези, що сила монархів корелює із результатами розвитку та рейтингом процвітання тих чи інших держав.

Ключові слова: монархія, монарх, повноваження, глава держави, країни Європи.

The peculiarities of the social and political development of many countries of the world in recent decades give reason to talk first about a “democratic explosion” in most of them (especially in the late 1980s – early 1990s, and sometime earlier or later), and subsequently more and more often and more often about the “erosion” or “deterioration” of the level of democracy in many of them. The signs of democratization in the world at different times were the collapse of the USSR, the collapse of the socialist camp, the actual victory of the USA as a “promoter” of the democratic world order in the “Cold War”, various “color” revolutions, etc. These events turned out to be enough to confirm the opinion about the democratic political regime as the most effective and the most stable. However, many states in the world were and remain autocratic and have not even tried or hardly tried various signs of democracy. Moreover, against the background of a whole series of heterogeneous crises, especially since the beginning of the 21st century, in particular global financial and economic, European and world migration, demographic, etc., today more and more processes if not autocratization in a completely pure form, then redemocratization, changes in meaning of democracy or “erosion” or “deterioration” of the level of democracy/democratic character both in democracies (some states even cease to be so) and in general in various types of political regimes.

However, these processes and the political reality inherent in them are most often highlighted due to the fact that democracy and democratization or autocracy and autocratization are traditionally evaluated on the example of states with a republican form of government. One way or another, such modern trends as electability, broad political participation, public control, civil society, publicity and openness of politicians are typically associated with republics. And

this is despite the fact that in reality not all republics are democratic, because many of them were and remain or are becoming authoritarian or hybrid political regimes. In other words, this means that today it is the republics that are the main focus of attention of researchers of political transit and constitutionalists, as well as the subject of interest of ordinary people.

Instead, monarchies today are mentioned less and less willingly, and for different reasons. Some believe that monarchies look like they have “outlived” themselves, and therefore they have either already been replaced by republics, or automatically fall into the category of historical heritage or antiquities. In this case, people typically associate monarchies only with certain symbols of this form of government from the past or with certain figures, in particular with feudal Europe or even the medieval world, authoritarianism, the luxury of palaces and the royal family, or until recently with the Queen of England or currently with Arab sheikhs, etc. Others complement this thesis and claim that monarchies outlived their worldview and context in such a way that this form of government today – especially in the 21st century – is positioned as very politically unmotivated in the conditions of technological development and post-modernism. Some involuntarily miss the fact that today a number of European states are still monarchies, because the latter are often simply called democracies or even parliamentary democracies. This is a little less characteristic for other regions of the world, which are distant from Europe in terms of history and outlook, and where monarchies are called caliphates, emirates, sultanates, etc.

Nevertheless, it is advisable to take a closer look at the phenomenon of monarchy, particularly in European countries, and pay analytical attention to it. At least given the fact that primarily democratic political regimes are really represented in Europe, and those of them that have not ceased to be democracies in recent years or have almost not become less democratic as a result of the global processes of “erosion” of democracy are primarily monarchical, not republican their forms of government. In addition, we can turn to the recently repeated position of the analytical organization “LegatumInstitute”, which in its periodic reports and in the annually updated prosperity index (“LegatumProsperityIndex”¹) states that the most successful countries in the world today are (in order from the best) Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Germany, Iceland. That is, in this list of top-10 states there are six monarchies and four republics. Instead, the top 10 worst countries on the analytical organization’s list for 2021 were (in order of worst) South Sudan, the Central African Republic, Yemen, Chad, Afghanistan, Eritrea, Somalia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan and Syria, among of which there is only one monarchy (for details, see Table 1). At the same time, in this case, the total calculations take into account the indicators of freedom and security (1), personal freedom (2), quality of government (3), social capital (4), investment environment (5), business conditions (6), infrastructure and market access (7), quality of economy (8), living conditions (9), level of health care (10), quality of education (11) and natural environment (12).

¹ LegatumProsperity Index, Prosperity, źródło: <https://www.prosperity.com/rankings> [odczyt: 30.11.2022].

A very similar pattern can be observed based on the results of previous reports and ratings of this analytical organization or within the framework of other similar projects, in which some European or even non-European monarchies traditionally occupy the top positions. Accordingly, this should radically change the attitude towards the monarchical form of government. After all, what difference does it make who rules the state, if it is effective?

However, in order to say that the most successful and prosperous countries in the world – but primarily in Europe – are such precisely because of the monarchical form of government, it is necessary, in our opinion, to analyze the essence and types of monarchies in Europe, as well as who has the largest influence on decision-making in the state. In other words, it is necessary to understand whether the monarch has real powers or performs a ceremonial role, and on this basis, to compare monarchical states on the basis of a single characteristic.

Table 1. Top 10 most prosperous and least prosperous (most declining) countries in the world according to the Legatum Prosperity Index project, as of 2021.

№	Country	Indicators / Separate country ratings by indicators											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Top 10 most prosperous countries in the world													
1	Denmark	7	2	2	1	4	5	9	8	3	18	3	8
2	Norway	1	1	3	2	5	9	19	11	7	4	10	10
3	Sweden	10	3	6	5	8	16	6	7	5	10	14	1
4	Finland	18	4	1	3	3	11	10	19	9	14	4	2
5	Switzerland	2	10	7	9	13	2	13	1	6	13	8	7
6	the Netherland	9	5	4	7	10	7	2	6	1	9	7	35
7	Luxumberg	3	7	8	19	22	6	11	2	8	12	34	11
8	New Zealand	26	11	5	4	6	14	23	17	30	24	12	4
9	Germany	21	12	9	16	16	13	5	10	2	16	23	14
10	Iceland	6	9	11	6	23	26	18	20	12	8	15	17
Top 10 the least prosperous (most declining) countries in the world													
158	Syria	165	166	164	166	147	164	132	120	100	110	129	158
159	Sudan	161	157	160	148	139	141	146	167	134	123	148	161
160	DR Congo	160	124	158	156	165	157	161	154	158	161	149	101
161	Somalia	159	144	162	129	149	161	152	166	156	163	141	135
162	Eritrea	136	167	163	162	155	158	162	156	163	136	155	116
163	Afghanistan	166	127	144	167	157	136	159	150	151	153	158	162
164	Chad	141	134	161	159	161	163	166	148	165	165	165	95
165	Jemen	163	164	166	154	162	155	153	165	141	137	153	148
166	CAR	154	143	153	163	163	162	167	122	167	167	166	94
167	South Sudan	167	160	165	164	154	149	165	155	166	166	167	121

Źródło: Legatum Prosperity Index, Prosperity, źródło: <https://www.prosperity.com/rankings>; <https://www.prosperity.com/about/resources> [odczyt: 30.11.2022].

In the case of the monarchies of Europe, this is detailed by checking whether in these popular countries, which are sometimes called monarchies themselves, the monarchs themselves are really weak, as scholars point out, since this does not quite fit into the historically established stereotype of this form of government. After all this will additionally contribute to the development and dissemination of information about monarchies in Europe, and therefore, possibly, to the popularization of this phenomenon. Thus, the purpose of the study is to review and systematize the essence of the institution of monarchy and its classification on the example of European countries, as well as a comparative analysis of the powers of European monarchies in order to develop an understanding of whether monarchs have real power or perform an exclusively symbolic role. It is noteworthy that the specified goal will be partially solved due to the development and approval of comparative and analytical indices that will allow to compare the power of the monarchs of different states, including from the point of view of the functionality assigned to them. Finally, we consider another rather interesting aspect to be the comparison of the power of monarchs and the place of monarchical states in the list of countries within the framework of the prosperity index. At the same time, our hypothesis is that the more powers the monarch has, or, in other words, the stronger the monarch is, the further (worse) will be position of a specific state in the list of successful or prosperous countries.

Regarding monarchies in Europe, it should be noted that this topic is quite controversial and ambiguous, since it can be looked at from different angles. So, someone rejoices at the preserved traditions of governance and, accordingly, defends the institution of monarchy in various European countries, while someone, on the other hand, is very dissatisfied and calls the royal/monarchic surnames a sham and nothing else. This is due to the fact that there are still disputes in society about the position of the so-called ruling monarchs and families in Europe. Similar discussions sometimes arise among scientists. After all, some scientists claim that the European monarchs of our time do not have any real power, being “decorative” and nominal figures and such that they are only symbols of national traditions and former greatness. On the other hand, others believe that monarchs are “sent” from above for good purposes and are positioned as quite influential in European countries to this day (or at least they can become as such if they wish, because they have the resources to do this). One way or another, virtually all European monarchies today are constitutional ones or similar to them, and this means (albeit to varying degrees) that the institution of monarchy in Europe is one in which the power of the monarch is limited, as a result of which he is in some or all spheres of the state power does not possess supreme (as the only political actor) powers. On the other hand, in general, the institution of monarchy in the modern world (and not only in Europe; there are about 40 states with this form of government) is a very flexible and multifaceted phenomenon, since it ranges from the tribal form, which still operates in some Arab states, to the monarchical version of democratic countries, which is characteristic of Europe (although the latter monarchies are also very different, as it will be noted below). This is one of the reasons why some monarchies are

more successful and prosperous than others (including in terms of the quality of life of their subjects), as well as why the influence of the monarchs themselves on the management of their states is different. Much more differences will appear when the monarchy is interpreted not only as a form of government, but as a set of certain ideas of state, spiritual and public order, etc. That is why the monarchy is still preserved and can be evaluated as quite relevant to the times, since it is quite universal in the context of the organization of power and the nation, if only because it can essentially coexist with the majority of modern socio-economic and socio-political development models.

As for Europe itself, this region has the second highest number of monarchies in the world, with 12 examples, including Andorra, Belgium, the Vatican, Denmark, Spain, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom, and Sweden (it is historically known that almost all countries of Western Europe were monarchies for a considerable period of time, but they ceased to be monarchies in an evolutionary or revolutionary way and with an eye on the development of democracy²). It follows from this list of countries that the monarchy in Europe is very specific, since the listed cases are almost entirely democratic (or in terms of inter-institutional relations, and/or in terms of the influence of the public and social sphere). Moreover, purely at first glance (and this will be verified later), the idea comes to mind that those monarchies that are territorially smaller, such as the Vatican, Liechtenstein, and Monaco, are more traditional (and stronger than in other cases) today, although they need attention need attention for other reasons as well. On the other hand, first of all logically ordered structuring of the institution of monarchy and its varieties on the examples of European countries definitely needs attention. In this regard, it is necessary to start first of all with the very well-known theorization, according to which all monarchies (including in Europe) should be divided into absolute, parliamentary and mixed/dualistic, and the last two are options of limited or constitutional monarchies³. The examples of parliamentary monarchies prevailing in Europe are Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom, Sweden, as well as partially or conditionally, as noted by A. Romanyuk and V. Lytvyn⁴, Andorra. Instead, Monaco and Liechtenstein are typically considered cases of mixed/dualistic monarchies in Europe, and the Vatican is a case of conditionally absolute, but elective (with an elected monarch) monarchy. Of this list of countries, as well as on the basis of taking into account the history of the institution of monarchy over the last hundred years – especially before, during and after the Second World War – it is possible to make an assumption (and it

² Roobol W., Twilight of the European Monarchy, *“European Constitutional Law Review”* 2011, vol 7, nr. 2, s. 272–286; Lauvaux P., Les monarchies: inventaire des types, *“Revue française d'études constitutionnelles et politiques”* 1996, vol 78, s. 23–24; Stepan A., Linz J., Minoves J., Democratic Parliamentary monarchies, *“Journal of Democracy”* 2014, vol 25, nr. 2, s. 35–51.

³ Stepan A., Linz J., Minoves J., Democratic Parliamentary monarchies, *“Journal of Democracy”* 2014, vol 25, nr. 2, s. 35–51.

⁴ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivniabnyi analiz politychnykh institutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimzbinstitutuinsnykh vidnosyn u trykutnykii “blava derzhavy–parlament–uriad” ta yikhmi naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 89, 99.

is often justified by scholars) that monarchs in Europe on average no longer play a significant role in the political process, which is why monarchies themselves are mostly parliamentary.

As a result, monarchs are not a threat to representative democracy, since the people who live in them – especially in parliamentary monarchies – in any case rule indirectly, in particular through the election of parliaments and the accountability of the prime minister and the government through pre-parliaments⁵. That is why the preservation of monarchies in some European countries happened only as a result of significant losses of royal courts, since they had to agree to constitutions that significantly limited monarchical powers and changed the source of legitimacy of power from “divine right” to “nation”⁶. In this context, the statement of A. Romaniuk and V. Lytvyn is relevant that if any of the monarchs in the countries of Europe made a systematic effort to influence or determine the political process, there would certainly be a public protest and a call for the abolition of the institution of monarchy even in spite of the fact that it traditionally appears as constitutional and even parliamentary⁷.

The phenomenon and institution of the European parliamentary monarchy in Andorra, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Sweden boils down to the fact that the monarch actually (but not always nominally) does not influence the executive power and state policy, since it is either prohibited by law, or the monarch does not exercise the political powers granted to him by tradition or even constitutionally. Instead, the main political figure in such a European monarchical state is the prime minister and the government cabinet headed by him, who dominate the executive power and depend for their formation and responsibility (in particular, possible early retirement) not at all from the monarch (as it was before and with which the monarchy is still stereotypically associated today), and from the nationally elected parliament⁸. In turn, the essence of the mixed/dualistic or semi-parliamentary monarchy, which is characteristic of Liechtenstein and Monaco among European countries, is that the head of state – the monarch – along with the parliament and the government, has a significant influence on the political process⁹, while the legislative process is traditionally anchored in the nationally elected parliament.

Along with this, the monarchs themselves can have some powers within the framework of law-making, which we can follow on the example of Luxembourg, in which since 2003 the

⁵ Elgie R., Heads of state in European politics, [w:] Magone J. (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of European Politics*, Wyd. Taylor & Francis Group 2015, s. 311–327.

⁶ Minoves-Triquell J., *Monarchy, a Democratic Paradox: The Head of State in European Parliamentary Democracies: PhD diss.*, Wyd. Yale University Press 2011, s. 25–28.; Fusilier R., *Les monarches Parlementaires – étude sur les systèmes degouvernement (Suède, Norvège, Luxembourg, Belgique, Pays-Bas, Danemark)*, Wyd. Editions Ouvrieres 1960, s. 79, 200.; Stepan A., Linz J., Minoves J., Democratic Parliamentary monarchies, *Journal of Democracy* 2014, vol 25, nr. 2, s. 35–51.

⁷ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivnialnyi analiz politychnykh institutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimizhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnyku “hlava derzhavy–parlament–uriad” ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 101.

⁸ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivnialnyi analiz politychnykh institutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimizhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnyku “hlava derzhavy–parlament–uriad” ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 101.

⁹ Elgie R., Heads of state in European politics, [w:] Magone J. (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of European Politics*, Wyd. Taylor & Francis Group 2015, s. 311–327.

monarch (who is called the prince) can veto virtually any law passed by the parliament, but at the same time and vice versa, from which it follows that the monarch also has a mandate to legislate. Another feature of this dualistic monarchy is that the prince can hire or fire any elected official and government official, but the people can demand a referendum on the termination of the powers of the prince himself¹⁰. In a similar way, the prince in another dualist monarchy in Europe – in Monaco – can choose state ministers, members of the government council and judges¹¹. Finally, among all European countries, absolute monarchy is peculiar only to the Vatican and is characterized by the fact that the head of state – the monarch or the Pope – appears as the strongest person in the state, since he nominally has both executive and legislative powers¹². At the same time, it should be noted that almost all monarchies in Europe and absolutely all parliamentary monarchies in this part of the world are hereditary, although monarchs receive their positions on the basis of various systems of succession to the throne (including systems of equal or absolute primogeniture, cognatic or male primogeniture, agnatic or patrilineal primogeniture or the so-called salic system)¹³. In particular, Andorra is technically a semi-elected diarchy, in which one head of state is the popularly elected president of France, and the other is the bishop of Urgel, who is appointed by the Pope. In turn, in the Vatican, the Pope is chosen by a conclave of cardinals, but the powers of the first are unlimited in time and very strong.

From a political point of view, the institution of monarchy in Europe is still preserved, on the one hand, as a political tradition, but at the same time, on the other hand, due to the fact that the monarchs (with the exception of the Vatican, Liechtenstein and Monaco) are very weak or quite weak, at least in fact, if not nominal. This is paralleled by the fact that democratic Europe today is in principle characterized by processes of weakening the positions and powers of heads of state, even if they are presidents (probably with the exception of France and Portugal, if we are talking about Western Europe, or Lithuania, Poland and Romania, if we are talking about Central and Eastern Europe), primarily in favor of governments led by prime ministers, formed and accountable to popularly elected parliaments (which is also the case in most European monarchies, including all parliamentary monarchies).

Accordingly, over a fairly significant period of time, the position – political and scientific (generally stereotypical ones) – that monarchs in Europe are ceremonial and purely nominal ones, and the level of their influence weakening in the political system is still incomplete, and will obviously continue (where this may still be the case) in the future. In other words, and as the researchers note, European monarchs essentially perform a “politically empty” function

¹⁰ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivniabnyi analiz politychnykh institutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimizhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnyku “blava derzhavy–parlament–uriad” ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 102.

¹¹ Gallois J.-P., *Le régime international de la particpate de Monaco*, Paris 1964, s. 61–64.; Roobol W., Twilight of the European Monarchy, *“European Constitutional Law Review”* 2011, vol 7, nr. 2, s. 272–286.

¹² Stepan A., Linz J., Minoves J., Democratic Parliamentary monarchies, *“Journal of Democracy”* 2014, vol 25, nr. 2, s. 35–51.

¹³ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivniabnyi analiz politychnykh institutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimizhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnyku “blava derzhavy–parlament–uriad” ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 102-103.

that does not bring significant dividends even to the political nation, not to mention the political system¹⁴.

Nevertheless, the historical roles, political and legal positions and powers of monarchs in the political systems of European countries are different, and therefore they require separate consideration, comparison and systematization. This, on the one hand, is done on the example of individual countries of Western Europe, whose monarchical forms of government are the loudest and most studied in political science, and, on the other hand, in the format of comparison and systematization on the example of complex, qualitative and quantitative (index) analysis of all the countries of this part of the world, which are different types and types of monarchies, which was mentioned above. Accordingly, in addition to the consideration and qualitative comparison of the power of European monarchs, their coverage and reduction to a common analytical denominator is appropriate through the creation of an index/coefficient of the power of European monarchs and, accordingly, its component indicators, which will allow analyzing the power of monarchs and “ranking” the analyzed countries / monarchies of Europe in accordance with the growth indicators of the power of authority of these heads of state. In other words, in such a case, we are actually talking about the coefficient of the power of the monarchs’ authority and the influence of the monarchies as such. After that, as indicated in the tasks of our research, special attention will be focused on the rating of the development of monarchies within the framework of the already mentioned prosperity index (“Legatum Prosperity Index”¹⁵) from the analytical organization “Legatum Institute” thanks to which it will be possible to check how the power of monarchs compares with the level of prosperity of monarchies in the region.

Therefore, all European monarchies without exception in their various types (parliamentary, dualistic and absolute monarchies) will be subjected to a comparative analysis within the specified subject focus in particular Andorra, Belgium, the Vatican, Denmark, Spain, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom (Great Britain) and Sweden. The level or power of influence of their monarchs will be analyzed and compared based on the array and sum of indicators, various analytical options for answers to which (verification options) have their own scale and rules of evaluation.

We propose to use 9 such indicators and evaluate them on a scale from 0 to 4 points, in particular, depending primarily on the influence of the other indicator within the framework of the total power of the monarchs (accordingly, our own author’s, albeit subjective, position on this issue was used for this purpose).

So, the list of indicators and their rating scale are as follows: 1st indicator – the way the monarch receives his powers and mandate: 0 points – if the monarch is elected, 4 points – if the

¹⁴ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivnialnyi analiz politychnykh instytutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimizhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnyku “hlava derzhavy–parlament–uriad” ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 108.

¹⁵ *Legatum Prosperity Index*, Prosperity, źródło: <https://www.prosperity.com/rankings> [odczyt: 30.11.2022].

monarch is not elected, and instead his power and mandate are hereditary; II indicator – the term of the monarch's powers and mandate: 0 points – if the monarch's powers and mandate have a certain term/period of validity; 4 points – if the powers and mandate of the monarch are not limited in time, but are lifelong (of course, the monarch can voluntarily get rid of his position – through the process of abdication – but this is not the case here); III indicator – checking the presence of the institution of the parliament alongside the monarch, which can participate in the legislative process: 0 points – if such an institution exists and is the main or only center of law-making or its analogue, etc; IV indicator – the presence of a restrictive monarch in the monarchy of the constitution in its codified form (constitutions in the monarchy are typically adopted precisely to limit the powers of the heads of state): 0 points – if such a codified and restrictive constitution exists; 4 points – if there is no such codified and restrictive constitution; V indicator – the authority of the monarch to nominate/appoint the prime minister as the head of the government cabinet: 0 points – if the monarch is not endowed with such authority at all; 2 points – if the monarch is endowed with such authority, however, the nomination or appointment of the head of government by the monarch requires the consent and approval of the parliament (the so-called investiture vote); 4 points – if the monarch is endowed with such authority and it is unilateral, that is, it does not require confirmation by any other political institution (primarily the parliament); VI indicator – the authority of the monarch to appoint judges and determine the judicial system of power in the state: 0 points – if the monarch has the listed powers and roles; 2 points – if the monarch has the listed appointing and/or functional powers, but they are limited (or due to the appointment of not all judges, but some of them, or due to the requirements for confirmation of such appointments by other institutions); 4 points – if the monarch is endowed with the listed appointment and/or functional powers but they are unlimited or complete; VII indicator – the authority of the monarch to be the subject of legislative initiative and to introduce bills for consideration by the parliament: 0 points – if the monarch is not endowed with the listed powers; 4 points – if the monarch is endowed with the listed powers; VIII indicator – checking the presence of the monarch of religious or confessional influence on his state: 0 points – if the monarchy is secular, even if the monarch has certain ecclesiastical functions; 4 points – if the monarchy is theocratic and/or the monarch is the head of a certain church or denomination; Their indicator is a check of whether the monarch has military or power influence in his state: 0 points – if the monarch has no such influence either factually or normatively; 2 points – if the monarch has such influence partially, in particular, has some powers in the military sphere, including appointing part of the command; 4 points – if the monarch is undeniably and positioned as the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of his state.

Through comparison (see Table 2), it was established that Europe is characterized by relatively weak or not very strong monarchs, because out of the maximum of 36 points, the highest empirically obtained is at the level of 22 points, and the lowest is at the level of 10 points. And

this is on the condition that in this case the constitutionalized or regulated powers of monarchs or their absence and not real political practice were taken into account (and in practice, monarchs today increasingly do not fulfill the powers regulated by them, in particular in favor of other political institutions). Within the sample, the strongest monarchs were found in the case of Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Norway, somewhat weaker – in the Vatican, the United Kingdom and Monaco, even weaker – in Andorra, Belgium, Denmark, Liechtenstein and Spain, and the weakest – in the case of Sweden. It is also quite remarkable that in Europe there is no single pattern of authority or weakness of monarchs, since some of them have strength in one or another authority, and some – in completely different ones, etc. In general, this proves that, even nominally, the power of authority of monarchs in Europe is a very blurred phenomenon and it is additionally worth thinking about on the basis of practice. On the other hand, it was established that, despite the popular stereotype, monarchs in Europe still have quite serious and not frankly nominal powers, at least formally.

Table 2. Verification of the complex index methodology for assessing the formal power of monarchs in European countries and its comparison with indicators of the development/prosperity of states

Country	Indicators of the power of formal authority of monarchs										Prosperity index rating
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	Cyma	
Andorra	0	4	0	0	0	2	4	0	4	14	n.a.
Belgium	4	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	16	23
Vatican	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	4	4	20	n.a.
Denmark	4	4	0	0	4	4	0	2	0	18	1
Spain	4	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	14	24
Liechtenstein	4	4	0	0	0	2	4	2	2	18	n.a.
Luxemburg	4	4	0	0	2	4	4	0	4	22	7
Monaco	4	4	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	20	n.a.
the Netherlands	4	4	0	0	4	4	4	0	2	22	6
Норвегия	4	4	0	0	4	4	0	2	4	22	2
United Kingdom	4	4	0	0	4	0	0	4	4	20	13
Sweden	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	3

Źródło: *Legatum Prosperity Index*, Prosperity, Źródło: <https://www.prosperity.com/rankings>; <https://www.prosperity.com/about/resources>[odczyt: 30.11.2022]; Own calculations; n.a. – not available data.

In particular, it was found (both on the basis of quantitative methods and as a result of a qualitative comparison) that in the constitutional monarchies of Europe the head of state typically possesses, at least nominally, simultaneously both separate functions of the legislative power and separate functions of the executive power, although the monarch performs them

jointly either with the national parliament, or with the government. Moreover, as stated by A. Romanyuk and V. Lytvyn, in the system of legislative power, the monarch usually promulgates acts of parliament, sometimes has the right of legislative initiative and even less often has the right of parliamentary veto, while in the system of executive power he is traditionally focused on the functions of international relations and defense issues. As for the religious influence of the heads of the monarchies, it is also gradually limited, since previously the monarchs were often the heads of national churches, and today they are less often endowed with such a status. Nevertheless, in relation to monarchs in Europe, the norm of their personal inviolability and immunity is not completely applied. There is a good reason for this, which is almost always valid in practice, since monarchs are typically positioned and associated as politically neutral with regard to the domestic political life of their states, and therefore they play an important role in ensuring and strengthening the socio-political and national unity of their states. In general, this allows us to affirmatively indicate that, although European monarchs have lost most of their historical powers and functions during total democratization in the past, as well as during the change of the socio-political context, they can still, at least nominally, influence on the formation of political reality. This is especially relevant in the case of hypothetical radicalization of public and political attitudes, terrorist and other threats, economic, social and political crises, when the idea of protecting the nation and sovereignty by means of entrenched political instruments comes to the fore, perhaps the most important of which is the institution of the monarchy and the monarch¹⁶.

At the same time, it is quite obvious that in no European monarchy, with the exception of the Vatican (and in this case we are talking only about constitutional – parliamentary and dualistic – monarchies), the monarch is not the main political actor in the state, but instead is inferior to this role and the real political one (but perhaps not public) influence on the prime minister, who actually (as well as increasingly nominally) heads the government and the executive vertical as a whole. This is quite surprising, because it may even contradict the data we received in Table 1, but the fact is that in this case we are talking about a real political process, and not normative or constitutional regulations, which sometimes indicate monarchs as relatively strong¹⁷. It is very easy to demonstrate this on the basis of such a regulatory power characteristic of almost all monarchs in Europe, such as the right or duty to promulgate legislative acts of the parliament¹⁸. Nominally, such a right or obligation can be interpreted as the right of legislative veto, in practice; European monarchs have long since disputed their duty to unquestionably

¹⁶ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivniabnyi analiz politychnykh institutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimzhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnykui "blava derzhavy–parlament–uriad" ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 118.

¹⁷ Elgie R., *Heads of state in European politics*, [w:] Magone J. (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of European Politics*, Wyd. Taylor & Francis Group 2015, s. 311–327.

¹⁸ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivniabnyi analiz politychnykh institutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimzhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnykui "blava derzhavy–parlament–uriad" ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 122.

sign, rather than promise, normative legal acts of parliaments in their states¹⁹. Thus, they do not speak for the national will of the nationally elected parliament. In a similar way, European monarchs are virtually powerless in the process of forming governments, because they imitate the political positions and relationships of parties, which correspond through popularly elected parliaments. This happens almost always, with a minor exception in situations when the parties cannot agree on the formation of governments, as a result of which the decisions of monarchs sometimes become decisive²⁰.

As a result, the formal powers of monarchs in European countries are typically residual or reserve and are strengthened only in times of crisis or emergency. Instead, in real life, the function of monarchs is usually reduced to social or cultural, because they act as figures around which citizens are united or can be united in periods of national crises or disasters²¹. That is why not monarchs, but heads of governments/prime ministers (if we are talking about monarchies) always participate in the meetings of the European Council at the same level as leaders or representatives of other European states²². On the whole, one can draw a conclusion about the real powers of monarchs in European countries based on the consideration and analysis of informal sources, in particular the mass media.

Applying an identical methodological scheme (as in the case of the formal powers of monarchs), it is possible to take into account such indicators of possible informal powers of European monarchs as (with identical answers according to logic: 0 points – the indicator does not work; 2 points – the indicator works partially; 4 points – the indicator is fully activated): I. Is the monarch popular?; II. Does the monarch use coercion?; III. Is the monarch conservative in his views?; IV. Is the level of support for the monarch high among the population?; V. Does the power of the monarch extend to countries other than his own?; VI. Does the monarch have dynastic ties abroad?; VII. Does the monarch support a certain party or lobby its interests? Their verification makes it possible to systematize, in particular using media data, the informal influence of European monarchs, in particular as shown in the table. 3 (in this case, the Vatican case is not taken into account as it is not always relevant). In this case, it was observed that monarchs in Denmark, Luxembourg, Norway and the United Kingdom should be considered informally the strongest. Instead, the weakest in this context are the monarchs of such European countries as Andorra, Monaco, Liechtenstein and Sweden. In general, the indicators of formal and informal authority of monarchs in European countries in this case are almost synchronized and comparable. However, a significant exception is the monarch/

¹⁹ Saalfeld T., The United Kingdom: Still a Single "Chain of Command"? The Hollowing Out of the "Westminster Model", [w:] Strom K., Muller W., Bergman T. (eds.), *Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2003, s. 648.

²⁰ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivnialnyi analiz politychnykh instytutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimizhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnyku "hlava derzhavy–parlament–uriad" ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 123.

²¹ Elgie R., Heads of state in European politics, [w:] Magone J. (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of European Politics*, Wyd. Taylor & Francis Group 2015, s. 311–327.

²² Elgie R., Heads of state in European politics, [w:] Magone J. (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of European Politics*, Wyd. Taylor & Francis Group 2015, s. 311–327.

prince in Monaco, who is formally much more powerful than informally, mainly because he is not very popular and well-known.

Table 3. Verification of the complex index methodology for assessing the formal power of monarchs in European countries and its comparison with indicators of the development/prosperity of states

Country	Indicators of the power of informal authority of monarchs								The power of formal authority of monarchs	Prosperity index rating
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	Сума		
Andorra	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	6	14	n.a.
Belgium	2	0	2	4	0	4	0	12	16	23
Denmark	2	0	2	4	4	4	0	16	18	1
Spain	2	0	2	2	4	2	0	12	14	24
Liechtenstein	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	8	18	n.a.
Luxumberg	4	0	4	4	0	4	0	16	22	7
Monaco	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	6	20	n.a.
the Netherland	4		2	4	4	0	0	14	22	6
Norway	4	2	2	2	2	4	0	16	22	2
United Kingdom	4	0	2	4	4	0	2	16	20	13
Sweden	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	6	10	3

Źródło: *Legatum Prosperity Index*, Prosperity, Źródło: <https://www.prosperity.com/rankings>; <https://www.prosperity.com/about/resources> [odczyt: 30.11.2022].; Own calculations; n.a. – not available data.

Thus, in general, it can be stated that at the current stage, there is no truly strong monarch on the territory of Europe. In general, almost all European countries considered are constitutional monarchies, in which the monarch and his actions are significantly limited by the constitution, traditions, laws, government, parliament, etc. This is due to the fact that today monarchs in European countries are rather a tribute to the traditions of certain countries and most often perform representative functions. Accordingly, on the one hand, institutions of monarchs continue to function in some European states, but they have long since lost the essence of sovereign power. On the other hand, the institutions of monarchs usually currently perform largely symbolic or ceremonial rather than the true political roles and functions with which historical monarchs are stereotypically associated. This is paralleled by the fact that the institution of the head of state in Europe today, with the exception of France and Portugal in Western Europe, as well as Lithuania, Poland and Romania in Central-Eastern Europe (we take into account mainly those countries that are members of the EU or associated with the EU), traditionally and gradually loses its political influence and importance. The consequence of this is the fact that today the political process and structuring of political systems in the format of representative parliamentary democracies is characteristic of European countries, in which decisive executive roles are assigned to governments and prime ministers, not heads of state

(presidents and monarchs), but the main legislators, in turn, are the national parliaments²³. In other words, this is also due to the fact that the heads of state in the democratic countries of Europe rule, but do not rule or govern, but instead perform nominal and symbolic roles, in particular, presiding over ceremonial events, etc. Surprisingly, this may be the reason for the success and prosperity of these countries.

On the other hand, our study did not prove the hypothesis according to which the power of monarchs somehow correlates with the development results and prosperity rating of certain states. As we can see, the power rating/coefficient of the monarchs and the prosperity rating do not match and are not opposite. Considering this, the power of the monarch is not a direct indication of the state's level of development in terms of economy, entrepreneurship, governance, education, health care, security, personal freedoms, social capital, etc. Although, in contrast, all the European monarchies studied by the organization "LegatumInstitute" are among the top 30 countries with the highest levels of prosperity.

And this is very important, because in general, monarchs have relatively weak heads of state, at least if we take into account the theoretical maximum of one or another analytical technique (including ours). In addition and as a conclusion, it is necessary to testify that the monarchical form of government has not outlived its usefulness at all. After all, monarchies are still in the outpost of states with the highest level of prosperity. Although European monarchs have lost some of their powers (in some cases very significantly) in the process of general democratization of the world and with the change of historical context, they still influence the formation of political reality in their states and even in the world.

REFERENCES

1. Elgie R., Heads of state in European politics, [w:] Magone J. (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of European Politics*, Wyd. Taylor & Francis Group 2015, s. 311–327.
2. Fusilier R., *Les monarches Parlementaires – étude sur les systèmes de gouvernement (Suède, Norvège, Luxembourg, Belgique, Pays-Bas, Danemark)*, Wyd. Editions Ouvrieres 1960.
3. Gallois J.-P., *Le régime international de la partitipate de Monaco*, Paris 1964.
4. *Legatum Prosperity Index*, Legatum Prosperity, źródło: <https://www.prosperity.com/rankings>; <https://www.prosperity.com/about/resources> [odczyt: 30.11.2022].
5. Lauvaux P., Les monarchies: inventaire des types, "Revue française d'études constitutionnelles et politiques" 1996, vol 78, s. 23–41.
6. Minoves-Triquell J., *Monarchy, a Democratic Paradox: The Head of State in European Parliamentary Democracies: PhD diss.*, Wyd. Yale University Press 2011.

²³ Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivniialnyi analiz politychnykh instytutiv i system kraïn Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvostimizhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnyku "hlava derzhavy–parlament–uriad" ta yikhmi naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020, s. 89-90.

7. Romaniuk A., Lytvyn V., *Porivniabnyi analiz politychnykh institutiv i system krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy. T. 1. Osoblyvosti mizhinstytutsiinykh vidnosyn u trykutnyku "hlava derzhavy–parlament–uriad" ta yikhni naslidky dlia politychnoho protsesu*, Wyd. LNU imeni Ivana Franka 2020.
8. Roobol W., Twilight of the European Monarchy, *“European Constitutional Law Review”* 2011, vol 7, nr. 2, s. 272–286.
9. Saalfeld T., The United Kingdom: Still a Single “Chain of Command”? The Hollowing Out of the “Westminster Model”, [w:] Strom K., Muller W., Bergman T. (eds.), *Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2003, s. 620–646.
10. Stepan A., Linz J., Minoves J., Democratic Parliamentary monarchies, *“Journal of Democracy”* 2014, vol 25, nr. 2, s. 35–51.