

Západočeská univerzita v Plzni

Fakulta pedagogická

Bakalářská práce

ROLE BRITSKÉ MONARCHIE V 21. STOLETÍ

Alena Papoušková

Plzeň 2012

University of West Bohemia

Faculty of Education

Undergraduate Thesis

**THE ROLE OF THE BRITISH MONARCHY IN THE
21ST CENTURY**

Alena Papoušková

Plzeň 2012

Tato stránka bude ve svázané práci Váš původní formulář *Zadáni bak. práce*

(k vyzvednutí u sekretářky KAN)

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci vypracoval/a samostatně s použitím uvedené literatury a zdrojů informací.

V Plzni dne 23. dubna 2012

.....

Alena Papoušková

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Mgr. Andrew Tollet, M.Litt., for his willing cooperation, patient guidance, and useful pieces of advice and help during the whole process of writing my undergraduate thesis. Furthermore, I would like to express my greatest gratitude to Barry Jones, B.A., M.A., Cert Ed, for his help with dispensing my questionnaire among native British.

ABSTRACT

Papoušková, Alena. University of West Bohemia. April, 2012. The Role of the British Monarchy in the 21st Century.

Supervisor: Mgr. Andrew Tollet, M.Litt.

The topic of this undergraduate thesis is the role of the British monarchy in the 21st century. Although the monarchy is based on tradition and rather obsolete principles, it still occupies an important position within the contemporary world. The aim of this thesis is to discover, whether the British monarchy is able to satisfy requirements and wishes of people even in the 21st century and if so, in what form the monarchy will function.

The thesis consists of three main parts. The first part is focused on the history of the British monarchy, with regard to the fact that every historic event considerably influenced the current shape of the monarchy and contributed to its maintenance to the present day. The second part describes contemporary features of the British monarchy and general tendencies of its further development. The third part of the thesis is practical and comprises of an original piece of research, which appraises opinions of the British on the question of preserving their monarchy in the 21st century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1 HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH MONARCHY	3
1.1 Origins of the Monarchy	3
1.2 English Monarchy under the Reign of the Normans and Plantagenets	4
1.2.1 English Monarchy as a Papal Fief	5
1.2.2 Magna Carta	5
1.2.3 Commencement of the English Parliament	6
1.3 Monarchy during the Reign of the Lancastrians and Yorkists	7
1.4 Tudor Monarchy	7
1.5 Stuart Dynasty on the English Throne	9
1.5.1 Long Parliament	11
1.5.2 English Civil War	12
1.5.3 Interregnum	13
1.5.4 Restoration of the English Monarchy	14
1.5.5 The Glorious Revolution and the Bill of Rights.....	15
1.6 Reign of the House of Hanover	16
1.7 British Empire under the Reign of the House of Saxe-Coburg Gotha.....	17
1.8 Windsors on the English Throne	18
2 CONTEMPORARY MONARCHY	20
2.1 Life of Queen Elizabeth II	20
2.2 Duties and Prerogatives of the Contemporary English Sovereign.....	22
2.3 Finances of the English Crown	24
2.4 Royal Family and the Media.....	26
2.5 Impact of Princess Diana on the British Monarchy	28
2.6 Republicanism in the British Monarchy	30
2.7 Scandals of the Royal Family	32

2.8	Changes within the United Kingdom during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth II	33
2.9	The Future of the British Monarchy	35
3	RESEARCH	37
3.1	Results of the Research.....	37
	CONCLUSION	49
	REFERENCES	50
	SUMMARY IN CZECH	54

INTRODUCTION

The United Kingdom has always represented a realm that significantly participated in the course of the human history. First records of a larger population which settled in England and which began to cooperate date from 2,000 BC. From these primitive tribes a renowned nation has developed, which has been involved in many important events affecting frequently even the entire world. Great Britain could pride itself on various prestigious sovereigns and historical figures, on its accomplishments during the world's colonization, or on its substantial role within the Industrial Revolution and the World Wars. Even nowadays the United Kingdom occupies a significant place within the world. And during this almost entire notable history Britain has been a monarchy.

The main features of the development of the English monarchy are continuity and a policy of compromises. However, as Sir David Lindsay Keir (1966) states, "yet continuity has not meant changelessness" (p. 1). Many times the English realm had to prove its ability to cope with various difficulties and the ability to constantly adapt itself to changing requirements of particular time periods. However, except for eleven years when it was a republic with Lord Protector as a Head of State, England succeeded in preserving the status of monarchy. In the course of time many kings and queens ascended the English throne but their reign never changed to despotism. Fortunately, whenever the rule in England began to incline to be despotic, a weak and irresolute sovereign succeeded to the throne, and in contrast, every time when the English monarchy was in a threat of declining or even perishing, it was saved by a powerful and successful monarch (Elton, 2000, pp. 74-75). This fact contributed considerably to the maintenance of the English monarchy until the present.

The location of the English kingdom could be also considered as its significant advantage. As an island, it was partly protected by the sea. Unlike England, continental realms had to more frequently defend their boundaries against incursions. Their inhabitants were, therefore, willing to provide their kings more power and resources to be able to protect their kingdoms. However, it also meant that people's freedom was limited. Despotic reigns of some sovereigns led to revolts of oppressed people and sometimes caused the downfall of the monarchy. In contrast, in the Middle Ages the English were provided more freedom because they were not entirely dependent on their king and his protection and the king was aware of this. The fact that kings did not have their own army and that they were much closer to their subjects secured a relatively peaceful development

of the English monarchy. Also money that would be normally intended for land forces and a king's army was spent on the navy instead. Thanks to this fact, England later succeeded in gaining control over the seas and creating an extensive empire, which was later transformed into the Commonwealth of Nations.

Although many kingdoms perished in the course of time, thanks to various fortunate circumstances the British monarchy has remained in constant existence. However, nowadays, at the beginning of the 21st century, the question may arise, as to whether there is still place for a kingdom in the modern world. Although several principles of the British monarchy, and of any monarchy in general, are in contradiction with a world based primarily on democracy, it seems that this political system is still acknowledged by many people. This undergraduate thesis focuses not only on a description of the history of British monarchy, which could clarify why this exact kingdom has maintained, but also on the question whether the British monarchy has prerequisites for the continuation of its existence even in the 21st century.

1 HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH MONARCHY

1.1 Origins of the Monarchy

Although England had been settled since 2,000 BC, the very beginning of the English monarchy dates from the final departure of the Romans early in the fifth century AD. The formation of a monarchy was also influenced by the arrival of Germanic invaders, including the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes (550 to 1066 AD). However, initially England was not a compact kingdom. There lived many small tribes, which were ruled by men usually referred as “*reges* or kings” (Cannon & Griffiths, 1988, p. 1). These communities did not have clearly delimited borders and their mutual relationships were usually regulated by various treaties of alliance. However, there were also many conflicts between them. More powerful tribes gradually endeavoured to subdue the others. In the seventh century England was a Heptarchy, consisting of the kingdoms of Northumbria, Mercia, Kent, East Anglia, Essex, Sussex, and Wessex. However, two centuries later there was only the kingdom of Wessex ruled by King Ecgbert, who is considered the first king of England. The unification of the kingdoms was also expedited by the Viking invasions. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle kings of these early realms are referred as *bretwalda* (Cannon & Griffiths, 1988, p. 9).

There is little detailed information available about these early kingships. The most significant qualities which predestined a man, hardly ever a woman, to become a ruler were his fighting skills. Initially, every king had to be a great warrior to be able to protect his tribe which voluntarily chose him as its leader. However, gradually there was a tendency towards a hereditary succession. Kings began to be elected by a council called “*witan*” (Maurois, 1993, p. 27) from one sacred family. The council, which consisted of eminent military leaders and later also of archbishops and bishops, not only chose the most convenient member of this family but it could also dethrone him when he proved to be a bad king. In summary, the early kingship was partly elected and partly hereditary. Only at the end of the ninth century were there tendencies of monarchs to control the succession by various agreement or wills in order to avoid disputes within the family.

Other duties of kings were comprised of law-making and at the same time of a supervision of how their subjects abided by these primitive laws. At that time almost all statutes were based on traditions and customs from the past. Subsequently, during the evangelization of England, monarchs began to hold the post that was similar to the priests’ one. They were responsible for converting their subjects to this new religion and also for

its defence and preservation. Christianity also significantly extended kings' powers so that some monarchs were convinced that they had obtained God's approval for their reign. This assertion gradually led to a belief that a sovereign was superordinate to common people and he could not be dethroned by them.

In the Dark Ages kings' powers were not unlimited. From the very beginning sovereigns were used to consulting their courts on serious matters. These courts usually consisted of military leaders, representatives of clergy, and nobles. However, at that time the aristocracy was not yet hereditary; people received titles of nobility for their service to a king. As the area of the English monarchy was gradually becoming larger, it was also impossible for a king to control the entire country. The kingdom was divided into individual shires and each of these shires was assigned a sheriff as a king's delegate. They were supposed to mediate between a king and his subjects and to maintain order in the shires. The image of a sovereign who is also interested in opinions and matters of their subjects represents a significant feature in the development of the English monarchy.

1.2 English Monarchy under the Reign of the Normans and Plantagenets

The Normans subdued England on the 14th October 1066 when William I of Normandy, later known as William the Conqueror, defeated the English army at the Battle of Hastings. In late September the English sovereign, Harold Godwinson, successfully confronted Norwegian invaders in the north but his exhausted forces were subsequently not able to repulse the Norman attack in the south. King Harold died in battle; William was crowned English king on the 25th December 1066 and the Norman sovereigns ruled in England until 1154.

The Norman Conquest influenced significantly the English kingship. Due to the fact that the English realm became a part of an extensive empire its monarchs did not spend much time in England. After William the Conqueror strengthened his position as king, he returned to the Continent and yielded the administration of the English kingdom to two joint regents. However, at that time many French came to England and replaced domestic nobles in significant administrative posts. The Normans brought not only their culture but also their developed bureaucracy along and "by the end of the twelfth century, England had the most sophisticated and effective monarchy in Europe" (Cannon & Griffiths, 1988, p. 158).

The role of king as an eminent warrior gradually disappeared and was replaced by his abilities of cooperation and governance of his country. Sovereigns' powers and duties

were also more specifically defined and publicly announced during the coronation. Moreover, the Normans substantially influenced rules of succession. In England, there had not been primogeniture and they had attached importance primarily to an heir's full age. In contrast, the French adhered to a rule that a king's first-born became his successor and this principle introduced into the English realm. Late in the twelfth century, there emerged a tradition of giving honorific titles to a monarch's descendants. It was implemented primarily to stress their role as a king's representatives.

The Plantagenets ruled in England from 1154 to 1399. During their reign there were three significant events that considerably influenced the sovereign's role and partly diminished his powers. The events included a change of English kingdom into a papal fief, signing of Magna Carta, and foundation of the first English Parliament.

1.2.1 English Monarchy as a Papal Fief

King John, who reigned from 1199 to 1216, had relatively precarious relationships with representatives of the Church. John became concerned about the future of his kingdom and this fact finally led to a significant concession of the sovereign. In 1213 he acknowledged the supremacy of the papacy. Until that time the English had believed that the only superior to a king was God. John's statement that English sovereigns would be subordinate to a pope, therefore, considerably altered the king's role.

1.2.2 Magna Carta

The reign of King John, later also known as John Lackland, was accompanied by various troubles and failures. At that time England lost many territories in France and for most of his rule the monarch was in dispute not only with Pope Innocent III, who finally excommunicated him, but also with English nobles. It made the king extremely unpopular and criticised. Maurois (1993) points to the fact that in the Middle Ages people often forgave their monarchs because even the worst king was still better than a period of anarchy. John Lackland was the first king who found himself in a situation where all his subjects joined against him (p. 94). However, his reign also positively contributed to the development of the English monarchy. The disaffectedness of the English led to the composing of Magna Carta, "an agreement between an able but unscrupulous and opportunistic king and a small group of his barons" (Painter, 1947, p. 42).

Magna Carta is considered to be the first document that not only detailed and limited the king's powers but also safeguarded the rights of his subjects. This treaty

represented a significant point in the development of the English kingship because it ushered in the end of the unchecked reign of sovereigns. By signing Magna Carta kings acquiesced that they would abide by the law as his subjects and at the same time that they would not contravene the rights of individuals.

Magna Carta was composed by English barons and signed by King John in Runnymede in 1215. Although it is a treaty of civil liberties, its liberties significantly differ from what people nowadays consider freedom. The English barons primarily insisted on the king's observance of their former privileges. They also stipulated that their approval would be necessary if the king wanted to levy an extra tax. Moreover, a special committee was established to supervise the monarch's reign. Other rights included a right of subjects to revolt against their king when he violated state laws, and the right of people to a fair trial, etc.

The influence of Magna Carta on the English kingship tends to be either too overestimated or too underestimated. Magna Carta primarily represents the first significant step in the process of democratization of the English monarchy. Although sovereigns ceased to respect Magna Carta in the fifteenth century, this treaty has always had an important role in the history of English monarchy. As Helmholz (1999) states:

Despite its imperfections, Magna Carta survived. More than survive, it flourished. It outlasted the death of King John, annulment by Pope Innocent III, and revisions pruning the extent of the powers granted to the barons. It assumed first place in the book of English statutes, served as a touchstone of the liberties of the English nation during constitutional conflicts of later centuries, and came in time to stand as a symbol of the rule of law against tyranny by the state. The deficiencies of its initial form and the desuetude of many of its chapters came to seem less important than the spirit that was thought to infuse Magna Carta's provisions. (p. 299)

1.2.3 Commencement of the English Parliament

The origins of the Parliament date from the reign of Norman monarchs. It gradually developed from their Great Council as a result of various disputes between kings and their subjects. However, "for the first few centuries of its existence Parliament was only an occasion and not an institution. It was called at the whim of the monarch, consisted of whoever he wanted to speak with, met wherever he happened to be, could last as long as he wanted, and had no independent officials of its own" (www.parliament.uk, 30.1.2012).

As a consequence of the acceptance of Magna Carta, kings were supposed to consult their barons on some serious matters. Subsequently, during the thirteenth century also civil representatives commenced to be summoned. Thanks to it, the king was not only informed about opinions of his subjects on the functioning of the monarchy, but he was also convinced that his laws would be better accepted by common people. However, initially the representatives were supposed only to listen and not to submit their own proposals. The first elected English parliament was summoned by Simon de Montfort in 1265.

1.3 Monarchy during the Reign of the Lancastrians and Yorkists

The rule of the House of Lancaster (1399 - 1461) and the House of York (1461 - 1485) was primarily a period of the diminishing authority of the Crown. This was caused by a series of civil wars, known as the Wars of the Roses. This conflict between the royal houses of the Lancastrians, as the red rose, and the Yorkists, representing the white rose, took place intermittently between 1455 and 1485.

The origin of the Wars of the Roses was the dispute of these dynasties over their accession rights. Henry VI of Lancaster was an heir in the male line, whilst Edward IV of York was a more rightful successor but in the female line and “the trouble was that there was no generally acknowledged rule that descent from a female of a senior line took precedence over descent from a male of a more junior line” (Cannon & Griffiths, 1988, p. 214). Although Edward IV of York was crowned the English king in 1461, the disputes continued. The war ceased in 1485 when Henry VII of Tudor, originally of Lancaster, became the English king. He married Elizabeth of York and the emblem of the new Tudor dynasty was a red-white rose.

The conflict between the Houses significantly reduced the number of the English nobles. The period of wars, chaos, and anarchy also damaged the Crown’s reputation among common people. The repeated glory of the monarchy was achieved during the reign of Tudors.

1.4 Tudor Monarchy

The Tudors ruled in England from 1485 to 1603. Their reign was characterized by an increase of kings’ authority and by an implement of a sophisticated administration of the monarchy. However, as Keir (1966) observed, “the beginnings of Tudor rule [did] not take the form of a breach with the past, nor of sweeping constitutional innovation, but of a

determined and successful attempt to make existing institutions yield their proper results” (p. 6).

After the period of unrests and fights between noblemen, there was a need for a strong king and a stable monarchy. Tudor sovereigns with a significant contribution of the minister Thomas Cromwell achieved it and restored the fame of the English kingdom. The successful rule of the Tudors was primarily based on the loyalty of their subjects, who appreciated that they had powerful and worthy monarchs, again. This period also represents a transformation of England into a modern monarchy and into one of the most significant colonial powers.

After the confirmation of succession rights of the Tudors, in the first place it was necessary to secure sufficient funding of the royal house, which would ensure its self-reliance. It was primarily achieved by the thrifty policy of King Henry VII, who acquired the needful money from profits of the crown estates and fees from his subjects. Although owing to the financial independence of sovereigns there was no need of a frequent summoning of the Parliament, the Tudors appreciated it and the Parliament gradually began to consolidate its position in the English monarchy.

During the reign of the Tudors also an efficient administration was achieved. Until that time significant administrative offices had been performed by noblemen, but now aristocrats were replaced by qualified men, taught at universities and able to improve the management of the English kingdom.

In the sixteenth century the most important event that significantly influenced the English kingship was the final breach of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. There were constant disputes between kings and popes. Although the sovereign's powers were not unlimited, the English believed that he had a special relationship with God and therefore they did not know why they should have tolerated another earthly authority, moreover an authority which was relatively distant from their country. The final conflict that led to the separation of English monarchs and popes was not theological, but political. King Henry VIII requested an annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon but the Pope refused. With a great contribution of policy of Thomas Cromwell the Church of England finally became independent and in 1534 Henry VIII declared himself as the Supreme Head of the Church of England, thus appropriated the ecclesiastic authority as well. Although many people were convinced that it was only a temporary situation, it turned to be a permanent change.

Another significant phenomenon of the Tudor monarchy was the accession of a woman to the English throne. Although King Henry VIII constantly endeavoured to have a male descendant to avoid succession disputes, he fathered only one son and two daughters. His son Edward VI succeeded to the throne at the age of nine and died six years later. Subsequently, his sister Mary I became “the first Queen Regnant (that is, a queen reigning in her own right rather than a queen through marriage to a king)” (www.royal.gov.uk, 1.2.2012).

1.5 Stuart Dynasty on the English Throne

The reign of the House of Stuart (1603 - 1714) is the most significant period in the development of the English kingship. At that time monarchs’ powers were substantially diminished, the Parliament strengthened its position within the English kingdom, and it was also the only time when England became a republic.

In the seventeenth century the Parliament was already an important constituent of the English kingdom. At the beginning of the rule of the Stuarts, the Parliament’s power was not extensive. Its representatives primarily heeded the king’s adherence to the formerly enacted laws and liberties whilst the governance of the kingdom still appertained to the monarch. Moreover, kings decided when the Parliament would be summoned and they also had the right to dissolve it. However, the sovereign was supposed to co-operate with his Parliament to maintain the favour of his subjects.

The reigns of the first Stuart kings, namely of James I and Charles I, were considerably problematic. Neither monarch respected the role of the Parliament in the administration of the country. During the rule of James I the theory of the Divine Right of Kings was declared and both kings endeavoured to achieve an absolutistic reign. However, as Glenn Burgess (1992) asserts, “the divine right of kings and the theory of royal absolutism were not the same thing. Both had long medieval pedigrees, but they were different pedigrees; [...] most theories of royal absolutism may have incorporated divine-right element, but the reverse was not necessarily true” (p. 841). The English were constantly convinced about the supreme position of their kings but at the same time they did not agree with James’ statement that monarchs should not be answerable to anybody for any of their actions. Neither James I nor Charles I succeeded in establishing an absolutistic reign because for a long time “England had really been a mixed state, not a true monarchy” (Daly, 1978, p. 238). The Parliament had already had its secured position

in the English kingdom and the rule of this early Stuarts led to serious conflicts in the country.

The main problem that the early Stuarts had to deal with was insufficient finances. They not only inherited some debts from Elizabeth I of Tudor but their way of government even aggravated the financial situation of the Crown. The sovereigns' decision to engage in various conflicts on the Continent proved bad because it was not only expensive but as for consolidating the power of the English monarchy also unsuccessful. Financial problems of the Crown led to bribery and sale of titles of nobility and as a result of this also to deterioration of the prestige of the king and monarchy in general. The decreasing popularity of the monarchy among common people was also caused by various fees the king decided to collect without the consent of the Parliament, namely "*tonnage and poundage*", "*impositions*", "*forced loans*" and "*Ship Money*" (Vodička, 2005, pp. 196-197). The monarchs also summoned the Parliament only when they were in need of money but they did not constantly respect its prerogatives. Representatives of the Parliament took advantage of the lack of money of Charles I and "in 1628 [they] forced the King to assent to the Petition of Right. This asked for a settlement of Parliament's complaints against the King's non-parliamentary taxation and imprisonments without trial, plus the unlawfulness of martial law and forced billets" (www.parliament.uk, 4.2.2012). The Petition of Right represented a significant constitutional document that altered the sovereign's powers.

During the reign of Charles I there were also many religious conflicts in England. The king opposed the Puritans and wanted to establish forcibly unified religious rites across the country. Moreover, the English as Protestants did not like his Catholic wife Henrietta Maria and were afraid of having a Catholic successor. Charles also endeavoured to unify the kingdoms of England and Scotland and this, together with his effort to interfere in the autonomous Scottish Church, led to a war between these two countries. In 1639 and 1640 there were several fights between England and Scotland but because of insufficient finances Charles was defeated and had to declare a truce. As a result of the expensive war with Scotland the Crown went almost bankrupt and the king was forced to summon the Parliament that became known as the Long Parliament and that is regarded as one of the most significant events in the history of the English monarchy.

1.5.1 Long Parliament

The Long Parliament was first called on the 3rd November 1640 by Charles I of Stuart and it represented a revolution in the extent of Parliament's powers in relation to the king's prerogatives. It is considered to be the origin of the future constitutional monarchy.

Representatives of the Parliament initially expressed their disapproval of Charles I's tendency to rule without debating serious matters with his Parliament; however, there were no assaults on the status of monarchy in general. The parliamentarians only wanted to prevent the sovereign from an absolutistic rule. First of all they impeached the king's minister Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford who, according to them, posed the biggest threat to the English monarchy. Although the impeachment was fabricated, Strafford was finally condemned and executed.

To avoid the Personal Rule of sovereigns it was also necessary not to allow the king to reign without the Parliament. Because of the Parliament's infrequent summoning and because of the right of the monarch to dissolve it when he wanted, it was difficult for the Parliament to substantially intervene in the king's policy. During the assembling of the Long Parliament three significant Acts that considerably diminished the sovereign's prerogatives were adopted. Charles I was forced to approve the Triennial Act and the Act against Dissolving, "to ensure that Parliament met every three years and could not be dissolved without its own consent," the Tonnage and Poundage Act, "to declare the collection of non-parliamentary taxation, such as ship money, illegal," and the Act that "[abolished] the prerogative courts which were seen as challenging the supremacy of the law" (www.parliament.uk, 4.2.2012).

Although Charles I pretended that he submitted to the Parliament's requests, at the same time he endeavoured to re-establish his Personal Rule. The hypocrisy of the king aggravated the disputes between him and his Parliament. In 1641 John Pym and other parliamentarians approved the Grand Remonstrance. David Plant (2008) defines it:

The Grand Remonstrance was a long, wide-ranging document that listed all the grievances perpetrated by the King's government in Church and State since the beginning of his reign. Rather than blaming the King himself, the Remonstrance emphasised the role of bishops, papists and "malignant" ministers and advisers who were alleged to have deliberately provoked discord and division between King and Parliament. [...] Thus the House of Commons was presented as the true defender of the King's rightful prerogative, of the Protestant faith, of the privileges of Parliament and the liberties of the people. (www.british-civil-wars.co.uk, 5.2.2012)

Subsequently, Charles I wanted to impeach some members of the Commons but was unsuccessful because they were warned and hid before the king could arrest them. This incident intensified tensions between the sovereign and the parliamentarians. The country gradually separated into two groups, namely groups of supporters of the Parliament, known as the “*Roundheads*”, and supporters of Charles I, known as the “*Cavaliers*” (Halme, 2011, p. 6). Although at that time it was still unacceptable to assault the king, the popularity and authority of the Crown significantly decreased. The disputes finally led to armed conflicts known as the English Civil War.

1.5.2 English Civil War

The term “English Civil War” refers to three wars between the Parliamentarians and Royalists that took place between 1642 and 1651. For a long time, there was an effort to avoid an armed conflict but the policy of Charles I finally thwarted any compromises. The whole situation was aggravated by religious animosities. As a consequence of the war, for eleven years England was proclaimed a republic. It was the only time in English history when the country was not headed by a monarchy.

At the beginning of the First English Civil War (1642 - 1646) there was no tendency to dethrone the king. At that time the English still considered him indispensable. However, the *Roundheads* only wanted to limit his powers and to remove his advisers. During the war England was divided into two groups, whose powers were relatively equal. Whilst the *Cavaliers* had a well-trained army, the *Roundheads* gained advantage through better funding and a connection with the English Navy. Although the king’s forces initially predominated, the Parliamentarians led by strong commanders, such as Sir Thomas Fairfax or Oliver Cromwell, finally defeated them at two decisive battles in 1644 at Marston Moor and in 1645 at Naseby. Although the Parliament won, conditions in England were still confused.

After the defeat of King Charles I in 1646 the leading position of the Parliament caused other disputes. Whilst common people longed for a re-establishment of former order, the army demanded an abolition of social hierarchy. However, the Parliament did not incline to any of these opinions and its rule finally commenced to resemble an autocracy. The Parliament’s ingratitude and policy of ruses exasperated the army and there were several conflicts between them. However, in November 1647 when Charles escaped from Hampton Court where he was kept, they united against him. In the Second English Civil War (1647 - 1649) Cromwell won again. Nevertheless, disputes between the

Parliament and army continued. In December 1648 forty members of Parliament were arrested and the Long Parliament changed into the Rump Parliament that could not resist demands of the army. For a long time, Oliver Cromwell did not know what to do with Charles I, who alienated many people because of his deceptive policy. After a divine inspiration, as he called it, Cromwell decided to charge the king with high treason to the English nation. Charles I was found guilty and executed on the 30th January 1649.

1.5.3 Interregnum

In the history of the English kingdom the period between 1649 and 1660 is known as Interregnum, which means the time when England was not ruled by a monarch. After the execution of King Charles I in 1649, Oliver Cromwell assumed the reign. The republic, called the Commonwealth, was declared in England on the 19th May 1649. The country was governed by Oliver Cromwell as a Head of State, who since 1653 used the title Lord Protector, and by the House of Commons.

The Commonwealth contented with various problems. Cromwell's supporters endeavoured to convince the English that they were ruled by representatives that they had chosen themselves. However, the English knew that the members of the House of Commons were assigned by the army and not by them. In fact, at that time there was a military dictatorship in England. Although, it was a republic, there were held no elections, because Oliver Cromwell was aware that his government would be overthrown.

Cromwell and his followers belonged to the religious group known as the Independents and their faith significantly influenced their policy. They claimed that they were chosen to rule the country by God. As Drake (1966) confesses, "there can be no doubt that Cromwell's theological position led him to believe that he had a very close liaison with the Divinity. He thought of himself as a special instrument of God's will, and the almost uniform success of his acts seemed to reinforce this belief" (p. 263). Cromwell's religious belief also contributed to the outbreak of the Third English Civil War (1649 - 1651). At this war the English army fought against Irish Catholics and Scottish Presbyterians. Cromwell defeated both countries and for the first time united all countries on the British Isles. However, even this victory did not ensure Cromwell popularity among the English.

Although at the time of the Commonwealth the rule was regarded as a military dictatorship, Cromwell and other Independents had to finally cope with the loss of the support of the army. At the beginning of the English Civil War the army was convinced

that it was fighting for democracy; however, when the soldiers became aware that they had helped establish an oligarchy, they rebelled against it. Cromwell was also not supported by common people. Although in 1649 the Rump Parliament dissolved the House of Lords and described it, together with the status of a king, as a threat to society, hierarchical division of people remained. Oliver Cromwell supported hierarchy based on merits of individuals, not on their birth. Cromwell with his Parliament gradually alienated the English as the former king did.

The Interregnum represents an uncommon period in the history of the British monarchy. On the one hand, the government system was described as a republic but on the other hand, it was not a republic to all intents and purposes. Cromwell's rule did not accord with the principles of a republic and although Cromwell refused the offered crown, he was "king in all but name" (www.notablebiographies.com, 14.4.2012). The Commonwealth ceased to exist soon after Cromwell's death because his son Richard was not able to maintain the power that was necessary to rule the country and from 1660 England became a monarchy again.

1.5.4 Restoration of the English Monarchy

After 1660 the reign of the Stuarts continued. In fact, the English were never against a monarchy, but only against an absolutist sovereign. Even at the time when Oliver Cromwell ruled the country, there were many people who helped Charles II, the son of the executed king Charles I, escape from England to Europe. In 1660 Charles II returned from the Continent as the English king, enjoying "the joyful acclamations of the people" (Halliday, 1995, p. 121).

At that time the English were already used to considerable civil liberties. After the accession of Charles II, it was clear that the sovereign would not be allowed to reign without the Parliament and to have his own standing army. Although Charles II remembered the fate of his father, he gradually endeavoured to gain more powers. He thought that he could achieve this by a connection with the Catholic Church, as was the case in France. However, the English were against papacy and the king's attempts to grant equal rights to Catholics were unsuccessful. Freedom of common people was also supported by adopting *habeas corpus* in 1679, a law that prevented the king from the unlawful arresting of his opponents. The right of subjects to lawful treatment represented an end of any despotic rule.

The restoration of the monarchy was also connected with the formation of political parties in England. During the English Civil War the English began to pay more attention to various matters concerning the government of their country. At that time the nation was divided into two groups. *Cavaliers* represented supporters of the king, whilst *Rounheads* were defenders of the Parliament. These groups gradually developed into political factions of *Tories*, who were advocates of monarchism, and *Whigs*, who struggled for a constitutional monarchy and emphasized the role of the Parliament. Despite different opinions, both parties condemned absolutism.

1.5.5 The Glorious Revolution and the Bill of Rights

During the reign of James II of the House of Stuart, the successor of Charles II, the English began to rebel against their king again. In contrast to the Civil War in 1640s, at that time assaults on the sovereign were no more considered as unacceptable. The English did not agree with James II's Catholic faith, law-breaking rule, and with the fact that he built his own army. During the time when the king did not have any male descendant, people tolerated his reign because they hoped that his successor would be his Protestant daughter Mary. However, in 1688 when James II's wife gave birth to a son, there was a tendency to dethrone the monarch. Following an invitation of some English peers, William III of Orange, Mary's husband and the sovereign of the Dutch, landed on the 5th November 1688 in England. James II recognized that he could not expect a support not only of his subjects but also of his army. Since the English wanted to avoid violence, they enabled the king to escape from the country.

After the departure of King James II the English considered how to announce a new sovereign. There were quarrels whether it was possible for common people, considering the divine nature of the kingship, to appoint a king. Finally, it was decided that James II's desertion would be regarded as a voluntary resignation and England could legally receive a new monarch. Following the wish of Mary and William, they ruled as joint sovereigns. After this compromise the divine right of kings maintained no importance. The revolution of 1688 is known as the Glorious Revolution and as Slaughter (1981) remarks in his essay, "[it] was the last occasion in English history of a struggle between king and parliament over the medieval problem of sovereignty" (p. 337).

The Glorious Revolution received its name because it might have dispensed with bloodshed. Although William arrived in England with his army, the accession of him and his wife on the English throne was through agreement, and not through violence. However,

it was not entirely true. As Dr Edward Vallance (2011) stated, “although bloodshed in England was limited, the revolution was only secured in Ireland and Scotland by force and with much loss of life” (www.bbc.co.uk, 7.2.2012). The Glorious Revolution is regarded as one of the most significant events in the development of the English monarchy. It changed the existing relationship between the Parliament and the sovereign into the supremacy of the Parliament.

All ideas of the Glorious Revolution were summarized in the Declaration of Rights which was confirmed by Mary and William before their accession. The Declaration of Rights was subsequently restated and enacted on the 16th December 1689 as the Bill of Rights, also known as the Act of Parliament. This statute had, unlike the Declaration of Rights, the legal authority. The Bill of Rights further diminished the king’s powers and it “is considered to be the cornerstone of the English Constitution. According to the new arrangement, the monarch would serve as head of state and possess a limited degree of authority, while Parliament would maintain the ultimate power. In other words, Parliament would be sovereign” (www.international.ucla.edu, 8.2.2012). The Bill of Rights together with the Glorious Revolution represents the final victory of the Parliament over the Crown. Since that time England has continuously been a constitutional monarchy.

1.6 Reign of the House of Hanover

The rule of the Hanoverians (1714 - 1837) was a period of relative political stability. Although the system of a constitutional monarchy further developed, the role of the sovereign could not be underestimated. Despite the diminution of the king’s prerogatives during the Glorious Revolution, “the monarch retained special power over the army, navy, and the Church, and in foreign affairs his position was strengthened by the fact that his ministers were, in many cases, dealing with his uncles, cousins, and in-laws” (Cannon & Griffiths, 1988, p. 444). The calm development of the English monarchy was disrupted only by the Jacobite Rebellions that occurred between 1688 and 1746. Supporters of the former king James II remonstrated against his deposition and wanted to restore the rule of the Stuarts. However, all these uprisings were finally suppressed.

George I, the first king of the House of Stuart, was enthroned at the age of 54. He was 52nd in the line of succession and became king only thanks to the Act of Settlement, an act that was adopted in 1701 and that prohibited a Catholic from being an English sovereign. The fact that England had a foreign king who did not speak English and did not know the laws of the country which he ruled, contributed to the development of the role of

the English Parliament. Since George I did not attend parliamentary sessions, because of his ignorance of the English language, it was necessary to find someone who could act as a deputy for the monarch. This gradually led to the formation of the office of the Prime Minister. The first English Prime Minister is considered to be Sir Robert Walpole, who was in office from 1721 to 1742, although at that time the function of the Prime Minister was not yet officially recognized.

The rule of George I is also connected with the establishment of the English Cabinet. However, it has its origins in the seventeenth century during the reigns of Charles I and Charles II. It gradually replaced the Privy Council that had been the most significant advisory body of English kings by the time. Turner (1913) depicts the development of the English Cabinet as follows:

The exact process, however, by which it developed from the Privy Council has not been clear. It may have begun as a secret body of advisers called together by the king rather as intimate friends than officials, and hence have gone on for some time in parallel development with the council; or it may have originated as a standing committee. More probably its origin is to be sought in both of these sources, [...] (p. 751)

Since the rule of George I (1714 - 1727) the Cabinet has been the key body of the executive power in England.

The Hanoverian monarchy was important not only from the point of view of the development of parliamentary powers. At that time England witnessed the commencement of the Industrial Revolution which subsequently spread to Europe and significantly influenced all aspects of the then society.

1.7 British Empire under the Reign of the House of Saxe-Coburg Gotha

The dynasty of Saxe-Coburg Gotha included only two monarchs, namely Queen Victoria and King Edward VII, who reigned from 1837 to 1910. Although even in the past England had significantly developed its navy and gained control over many colonies, it was during the rule of Queen Victoria and King Edward VII when the British Empire was in its heyday and became the largest colonial empire in the human history. Ferguson (2007) asserts that at that time the British Empire occupied approximately 25 per cent of the earth's surface and commanded approximately 444 million people (p. 264). This period is also characterized by the impressive industrial, scientific, and political expansion.

The reign of Queen Victoria is the longest reign of all English monarchs. She ruled for 63 years and 7 months and this period of time is known as the Victorian era. Victoria was initially a member of the House of Hanover, but in 1840 when she married Prince Albert, Duke of Saxe-Coburg Gotha, the name of the Royal Family was changed. At that time a sovereign in the constitutional monarchy had three significant rights - the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, and the right to warn. Although the monarch's political powers had been diminished, Queen Victoria still considerably influenced conditions in England.

Queen Victoria served primarily as a national symbol. After a slight decline of the prestige of the English monarchy during the reign of the Hanover dynasty, whose monarchs were initially foreigners, and in the case of George III due to an illness also mad, Queen Victoria restored the glory of the English kingdom. She did not like aristocratic pomposity, but attached great importance to a calm family life and to virtues in general. She was honoured and loved by the English and primarily thanks to her popularity the English monarchy remained preserved despite republican movements that occurred in Europe in the 19th century.

There were only two relatively insignificant republican movements in England during the reign of Queen Victoria. The first one occurred short after her accession when she overstepped her powers and interfered into the forming of a government, and the other occurred when after her husband's death she lived for a long time in seclusion and avoided public appearances. However, neither of these represented a serious menace for the monarchy. Victoria remained one of most successful and popular monarchs and the reign of hers and of Edward VII's represented an imposing period of the English monarchy.

1.8 Windsors on the English Throne

The House of Windsor has ruled England since 1910 until today. The dynasty of Saxe-Coburg Gotha was renamed by King George V in 1917. At that time there were strong anti-German feelings in Europe and the king decided to replace the originally German name of the dynasty with the name Windsor that reflected the British tradition. First years of the reign of the Windsors are characterized by further democratization of the monarchy. On the one hand prerogatives of the House of Lords as well as of aristocrats in general were diminished, whilst on the other hand the Royal Family endeavoured to get closer to common people. As new mass communication technologies were introduced, the king and other representatives of the Royal Family used them to link their lives with lives

of their subjects. At that time the sovereign represented primarily a national and moral icon with no real powers.

During the reign of the Windsors the monarchy had to cope with a serious crisis. King Edward VIII, who succeeded to the throne in 1936, fell in love with Mrs Wallis Simpson, a twice-divorced American. However, the sovereign, as the Supreme Head of the Church of England, could not marry a divorced woman and such a queen would also not be accepted by the English. Edward VIII finally decided to abdicate and ceded the reign to his younger brother Albert, who consequently ruled as King George VI. Edward, as well as his descendants, was excluded from the succession to the English throne and from the Royal Family in general. The Abdication Crisis disrupted the stability of the Crown. The English were exasperated that their king decided to leave his nation because of this divorced American. However, since the new sovereign George VI was a respectable man, appreciated for his calm family life, and since many people honoured the status of the Crown, the abdication did not represent a serious menace for the existence of the English monarchy. As Cannon and Griffiths (1988) remark, “in fact, the crisis revealed how little republican feeling there was in the country” (p. 605).

The popularity of the Crown was fully recovered during the Second World War. King George VI, together with his wife, decided to stay in Buckingham Palace to face the dangers of the war in the same way as their subject did. Although Buckingham Palace was several times bombed, the Royal Family persisted and often visited ruined quarters and towns to support their subjects. This attitude made the king very popular and honoured. George VI died in 1952 and his successor became his older daughter, the current Queen Elizabeth II.

The reign of the early Windsors was primarily a period of modernisation of the monarchy. The Crown had to adapt itself to the changing trends of the development of the society. Although as a consequence of the World Wars many kingdoms ceased to exist, the English monarchy remained intact. As English politician, historian, and journalist Tristram Hunt (2011) confesses, “barring the English republic of the 1650s, it was for centuries quite inconceivable to think of [British] national life devoid of monarchy” (p. 168).

2 CONTEMPORARY MONARCHY

The British monarchy could pride itself on its long and distinguished history. It has demonstrated a significant ability to accommodate itself to changing requirements of different time periods and endured when many other kingdoms perished. Even nowadays, at the beginning of the 21st century, it has its indispensable place in the lives of many people. To be able to exist in the modern world, it has had to change itself extensively. There are several significant events that have influenced the current shape of the modern British monarchy and several distinctive features that characterize it.

2.1 Life of Queen Elizabeth II

For sixty years British monarchy has been reigned by Queen Elizabeth II, the eldest daughter of the previous King George VI. Her official title is:

her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, by the grace of God monarch of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, sovereign of Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Jamaica, Barbados, Fiji, the Bahamas, Grenada, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Belize, Antigua and Barbuda, St Christopher and Nevis, head of the Commonwealth and the Church of England's Defender of the Faith.

(Paxman, 2007, pp. 8-9)

Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Windsor was born 21st April 1926 as the first child of Prince Albert, Duke of York, and Lady Elizabeth Bowes-Lyon. After her birth the tabloid newspaper *The Daily Sketch* stated, "a possible Queen of England was born [...]" (Lacey, 2003, p. 78). However, since Elizabeth was at her birth third in the line of succession, serious newspapers did not refer to "such remote speculation" (Lacey, 2003, p. 78). This changed in December 1936 when her uncle, King Eduard VIII, abdicated and her father became King George VI. Elizabeth was suddenly the direct successor to the British throne and she started to be prepared for her future role.

Elizabeth never visited a common school but she had private tutors. She studied constitutional history and law and was furthermore prepared for duties that she would once have as the Queen of England. Her first significant public appearance is considered to be her speech on the radio in 1940, which was meant for all children and which clarified why Britain became involved in the Second World War. She gradually started to attend many official duties and tours together with her parents. In 1945 she joined the British Army, namely The Auxiliary Territorial Service, in which she with other women served as

mechanics and drivers. On 20th November 1947 Elizabeth married Philip Mountbatten and within a year their first son Charles, heir apparent to the throne, was born. On 6th February 1952 Elizabeth's father died and she became the Queen of England.

Elizabeth was officially crowned 2nd June 1953. As the Queen she "was at one with her father and grandfather, devoted to county life, and with a powerful sense of public duty" (Cannon & Griffiths, 1988, p. 615). During her reign the British monarchy has undergone several transformations and Elizabeth has endured several difficulties. In 1957 and 1963 the Queen had to solve a complicated and rather controversial problem concerning the choice of the Prime Minister. As a result, in 1965 the method of appointing the party leader the Prime Minister was introduced. Although this meant a further diminution of the sovereign's powers, it was positively accepted as a way of avoiding potential disputes.

The role of the British monarchy altered considerably primarily within the international sphere. It was during the reign of Elizabeth II when the British Empire finished its transformation into the Commonwealth of Nations. Although in the course of years many countries of the former British Empire obtained independence, they mostly wished to remain a part of the Commonwealth of Nations, recognizing the Queen of England as Head of the Commonwealth. Until today Elizabeth II serves as Head of State of 16 countries of the Commonwealth of Nations.

The life of Queen Elizabeth II, both personal and public, has been varied. Being a British sovereign includes not only many duties but also the loss of a private life. Cannon and Griffiths (1988) avow that "the queen's working year is a cycle of receptions and audiences, investitures and garden parties, opening ceremonies, and state visits, with the relentless stream of official boxes demanding constant attention" (p. 627). It is assessed that Queen Elizabeth II annually performs approximately 430 various engagements and that in her lifetime she has already "undertaken over 256 official overseas visits to 129 different countries" (www.royal.gov.uk, 20.3.2012). Besides the official duties the Queen devotes any free time to her family. At the time of writing, Elizabeth II has four children, eight grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. She is also fond of horses and dogs.

On 6th February 2012 Elizabeth II celebrated her Diamond Jubilee of 60 years on the throne. This raised the question of whether the Queen would manage to surpass the hitherto longest rule of an English monarch, namely that of Queen Victoria who reigned for 63 years and 217 days. To achieve this, Elizabeth II will have to reign at least until the 10th September 2015. Although she has been on the throne for such long time, she is still

very popular with the British. Many people admire her sense of duty, loyalty to Britain, highly representative manners, and a life devoid of scandals. The Queen has devoted her entire life to the service for her subjects and for the United Kingdom. Therefore, she has earned considerable respect even of those people who are otherwise supporters of a republic (Lloyd, 1996, p. 54).

2.2 Duties and Prerogatives of the Contemporary English Sovereign

In the course of time prerogatives of English sovereigns have been weakening at the expense of powers of the Parliament. Nowadays, Britain is a constitutional monarchy which represents a “system of government in which a monarch shares power with a constitutionally organized government” (www.britannica.com, 6.3.2012). The English Queen as a constitutional monarch is not supposed to make decisions only by herself but she acts on the advice of her ministers. It is said that “*the Monarch reigns, but not rules*” (Rovná, 2004, p. 72). The British monarchs have retained three substantial rights, namely the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, and the right to warn. Although the current Queen Elizabeth II does not have almost any actual political powers, she still holds an important position within the English monarchy.

The English Queen serves primarily as Head of State. This role includes duties such as the opening of Parliament or appointing the Prime Minister. Although the Queen has theoretically the right to choose the Prime Minister, it is a convention to offer the post to the leader of the party that obtained a preponderance of seats in the House of Commons. During his term in office the Prime Minister has every week, usually on Wednesday, an audience with the Queen. At these confidential sessions the Prime Minister not only familiarizes the Queen with intents of the government but the Queen is also privileged to express her own opinion on these matters. Other prerogatives of the English sovereign are comprised of the rights to assemble, prorogue, and dissolve the Parliament. The Queen’s approval is also necessary when passing Acts and Bills of Parliament and calling a general election. Furthermore, the Queen awards various honours, orders, and titles of nobility, grants pardons, and appoints significant political and judicial representatives. In all these matters the Queen primarily acts on the advice of her ministers, except for awarding *The Order of the Garter*, *The Order of Merit*, and *the Royal Victorian Order*, which lies solely within the Queen’s authority.

The British Queen represents an important element of the entire British political system. Whilst governments frequently change, the Queen remains, providing an essential

political stability. For instance, during the reign of the current Queen Elizabeth II there have already been twelve Prime Ministers in Britain. The political stability of the Queen is furthermore emphasized by her political neutrality. Since she daily receives various important political documents, which are stored in well-known “red boxes” (Rabley, 1990, p. 10), the Queen is also regarded as the person with the best knowledge of the British politics.

Other titles that the British Queen holds are Defender of the Faith and Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Head of the Armed Forces. These include prerogatives of the Queen to appoint archbishops and bishops and to open the Synod, the supreme body of the Church of England. The relation between a British monarch and the Church of England is also supported by the fact that no one but a member of this religion can become a sovereign and that at the coronation one part of the sovereign’s oath is a pledge to maintain the Church of England. Since the Church of Scotland is an independent community, the English Queen has no privileged position in it. As Head of Armed Forces the Queen solely has the right to declare war and peace, though in practice she acts on the advice of her ministers. Furthermore, each member of the Royal Forces, except for the Royal Navy, has to promise allegiance to the British sovereign. The Queen expresses support to soldiers on service in Great Britain or abroad and to their families. She also awards some of the servicemen for special merits. For centuries the relation between English sovereigns and their Armed Forces was firm, even nowadays many members of the Royal Family serve in some of the Royal Forces.

The Queen’s activities also include less official matters. Although Elizabeth II is still involved in many political dealings, she does not have any actual powers and her main role is representative. The English Queen primarily serves as a national symbol. She not only unifies the whole nation but also helps maintain pride and national consciousness of the British. In the course of the year the Queen participates in many celebrations of various significant anniversaries, religious feasts, public holidays, and other special occasions, during which she can also come in contact with common people. Furthermore, she provides emotional support at various disasters. Therefore the most important duty of the Queen is to be seen.

Another sphere of the Queen’s activity consists of her charity work. The significance of the British monarch is not only given by his or her functioning as a national icon and expressing fellow feelings to the subjects. Not only the Queen but also many members of the entire Royal Family support the public directly by their engagement in

many, sometimes even their own, charitable societies, which help physically or mentally challenged people, socially disadvantaged people, young people, and many others. They are also involved in various organisations that fight for animal rights and for nature conservation. It is stated that the Queen herself has more than 600 patronages (www.royal.gov.uk, 7.3.2012). The aid to charitable organisations does not include only giving money to them, but a patronage of a famous person also raise public awareness of these problems.

Elizabeth II executes significant duties not only within Great Britain but also throughout the world. Annually she undertakes many international trips and receives many eminent foreign personalities in her residences in Britain. The Queen, who acts as a representative of the British nation, helps cultivate good relationships among various countries. The international significance of the Queen is also supported by her role as Head of the Commonwealth, which is “a free association of sovereign states comprising the United Kingdom and a number of its former dependencies who have chosen to maintain ties of friendship and practical cooperation and who acknowledge the British monarch as symbolic head of their association” (www.britannica.com, 7.3.2012).

The role of the British sovereign includes not only many prerogatives but also many duties. It would be impossible for the Queen to manage all these engagements only by herself; therefore, it is necessary for the Royal Family to help the Queen and deputize for her when she cannot participate personally. It is assessed that the members of the Royal Family participate in more than 2,000 various social occasions both in Great Britain as well as all over the world per year. The layout of duties between the British politicians, who are responsible for the administration of the country, and the Royal Family, whose main task is to serve as national icons and to represent Britain all over the world, is mutually advantageous. As for instance Jones and Kavanagh (1991) note “the British system also offers an advantage over the US system, where the President has to combine onerous chief executive functions with time-consuming head of state duties” (p. 111).

2.3 Finances of the English Crown

One of the most common arguments of those who are against the monarchy is its expensive administration. Republicans often claim that the Royal Family not only costs English taxpayers a large amount of money but also does not bring Britain sufficient benefit. However, many statistics disprove this claim. It was, for instance, ascertained that the annual expenses of the American President are much higher than those of the British

Royal Family and the Prime Minister in total (Rabley, 1990, p. 11). The Queen also contributes to tourism. Millions of tourists from all over the world visit Britain every year. Among their most common destinations rank places and events related to the history or present days of the English monarchy. Tourism represents one of the most significant branches of the British economy. It was reckoned that in 2011 it yielded £115.4 billion and the contribution of the Royal Family on this sum cannot be doubted. (www.visitbritain.org, 29.2.2012)

The English sovereign receives funds for matters connected with administration of the monarchy from four main sources, namely from the Civil List, grants-in-aid, the Privy Purse, and from his or hers personal income. The Civil List represents the principal financial source of the British monarchy. Its origins date from the reign of William and Mary in the seventeenth century who signed the Bill of Rights and recognize the supreme role of the Parliament. In return, they were given money necessary for the governance of the monarchy. The Civil List was transformed to its current form in 1760 at the reign of George III. The yearly rate of this financial aid has changed according to the economic situation in Britain. It is primarily intended to cover costs associated with salaries of employers of the Royal Household and hospitality of garden parties and state visits. (Morrison, 2009, pp. 25-28)

Grants-in-aid are designated for expenses spent on functioning of royal residences and on transport, communication, and correspondence of the members of the Royal Family. The Privy Purse represents earnings from the Duchy of Lancaster which covers other official and private expenses of the Queen that are not paid from the Civil List. Elizabeth II also has her personal income at disposal. Her possession is derived primarily from her investment portfolio and from profits from her private estates. This source is intended to cover Queen's personal expenses, which also included her charity work and maintenance of her private residences, such as Balmoral or Sandringham (Morrison, 2009, pp. 25-28). Although the Queen is sometimes reprehended for her wealth, it is necessary to realize that a considerable part of her possession comprises of art collections, residences, and jewellery and that she is not empowered to treat it.

Another disputed point related to the royal finances has for a long time been tax accounting of the sovereign. Many republicans assert that the Queen only lives from money drawn from the British taxpayers and she herself enjoys considerable tax relief. Nevertheless, these opinions are not entirely true. The English Queen has always been obligated to pay indirect taxes, but in 1992 Elizabeth II agreed to pay direct taxes, namely

income tax and capital gains tax, as well. This consent represented the result of the great fire of Windsor Castle in 1992 and the following criticism of the British of the fact that the reparations were largely paid by common taxpayers. Although in 1992 the Queen's tax policy considerably changed, there are still some tax advantages that give preferential treatment to the Queen and some other members of the Royal Family.

Finances of the Royal Family represent an often discussed and sometimes also criticised issue. To avoid such speculations the Queen has for a long time endeavoured to make the royal economic system not only efficient and thrifty but also transparent. Therefore annual reports of royal expenses are published and provided for the public. When the amount of funds granted to the sovereign is reproached, it is usually answered that if George III had not exchanged the royal estates for regular allowances from the government, the Royal Family would be able to cover all its expenses by profits from these estates (Parker, 1996, pp. 294-295). In April 2012 the existing system of funding including the Civil List and grants-in-aid should be replaced by a new one called the Sovereign Grant. It represents the most important reform of royal funding since the enactment of the Civil List in 1760.

2.4 Royal Family and the Media

During the twentieth century the British monarchy underwent many changes. Until that time sovereigns had been primarily focused on circumscribing their powers and on developing relationships with their noblemen and subjects. Although in the twentieth century the role of the English king as a constitutional monarch was largely determined and quite stable, the English monarchy was faced with a significant task to adapt itself to the new mass media world. Mass media gradually became an important part of the lives of common people and it also started to influence considerably their opinions and attitudes. Surveys conducted in the 1990s discovered "that 60 - 70 per cent of people [cited] television as their major source of political information with the press a poor second at 25 - 30 per cent" (Jones & Kavanagh, 1991, p. 97). Since kings and queens no more dispose of actual powers they endeavour to use mass media to strengthening their position.

English monarchs gradually allowed the mass media to penetrate into their lives. Since the reign of George V they regularly used radio broadcasts and Queen Elizabeth II became the first monarch whose coronation in 1953 was televised. The broadcast from Westminster Abbey was watched by millions of people not only in Britain but also all over the world. Since that time the Crown has been trying to use every new communication

technology that appears, such as e-mails, official websites, channels on YouTube, or Twitter and Facebook accounts. These modern communication technologies enable the Royal Family to enter the households of common people. Whilst in the past it was almost impossible for many English people to meet the sovereign, now thanks to mass media they could acquaint themselves more closely with the personality of their monarch.

The mass media may not do the Crown only good but often also harm. It is therefore necessary for the members of the Royal Family to learn how to use the mass media to their own benefit. As occasions when TV appearances slightly damaged the reputation of the Royal Family could be considered not only the participation of some of its members, namely Prince Edward, Prince Andrew, Princess Anne, and Sarah Ferguson, in the comic TV show called *It is a Royal Knockout* in 1987, but also the documentary film called *The Royal Family* which was shot in 1969 and watched by approximately two thirds of the British. Although the documentary was made in a serious way, as also famous naturalist and broadcaster David Attenborough pointed out, it destroyed the natural mystery of the Crown. Since the members of the Royal Family let the media into their privacy, they not only revealed the mystique important for the correct functioning of the monarchy, but also supported the undesirable interest of media, especially tabloids. (Seward, 2004, p. 163)

In the twentieth century, due to the spread of mass media, the status of the members of the Royal Family significantly changed. Whilst originally they were regarded more as authorities and national symbols, now another feature of the kingship appeared: the role and fame of the Royal Family started resembling that of famous singers and actors. As Paxman (2007) noted, “by the late twentieth century, royalty had been replaced by television celebrities with familiar faces, better teeth and sharper elbows. The new aristocrats are soap-opera stars and musicians” (p. 260). Likewise these stars they often appeared in tabloids and stories about their private life attracted attention of many British. It was discovered that “when magazines have a British ‘royal’ on the cover they sell between 10 % - 20 % more copies” (Rabley, 1990, p. 3). However, since tabloids primarily deal with sensational and shocking articles, the revealed scandals of some members of the Royal Family considerably contributed to the decreasing popularity of the Crown.

2.5 Impact of Princess Diana on the British Monarchy

The one person who considerably disrupted the relatively calm development of the modern British monarchy is regarded Princess Diana. In her short lifetime she managed to affect the lives of many people all over the world and become immensely popular. It is said that at the time “she was the most photographed woman in the world” (www.people.com, 14.3.2012). During her life she not only outshone the British Queen and other members of the Royal Family but her unexpected death altered the status of the entire monarchy (Seward, 2004, pp. 19 and 145).

Lady Diana Francis Spencer was born 1st July in 1961 in Norfolk. The Spencers represent an old and eminent English family with a close connection to English monarchs. The relationship between Lady Diana and Prince Charles unfolded from the summer of 1980 and their official engagement followed in February 1981. The couple was married at St Paul’s Cathedral 29th of July 1981 and the ceremony was watched by many people all over the world. Since Diana was the first common woman who married the successor to the British throne, people started to call her “a fairy-tale princess” (Gilchrist, 1998, p. 1). However, in fact her life did not recall a fairy-tale. Diana who, unlike the members of the Royal Family, was not prepared for a life in public which was furthermore controlled by many rules, found it difficult to satisfy the exacting requirements of the Royal Family. The difference between their ways of life contributed to subsequent conflicts.

Whilst the uneven marriage between Charles and Diana soon started to be accompanied by problems, Diana’s popularity grew. As Seward claims, many people all over the world liked this shy and natural woman who was not afraid to express her emotions in public, no matter whether for her sons or for strange people. Being with her, they felt free to confide their troubles to her because she was always willing to listen. Furthermore, many people even identified with her when she was openly talking about her misfortune concerning an unhappy marriage or suffering from bulimia. She was also appreciated for her relation to children. For instance, she had no problems to bend down while talking to a child. That differentiated her from other members of the Royal Family. For centuries they were led to moderation, reverence for the protocol, and keeping distance from other people. Diana’s behaviour, including how she later confided her troubles to the media, evoked an antipathy towards her among the Royal Family (Seward, 2004, p. 30).

Diana was also admired for her charity work. Although many members of the Royal Family participated in various charitable organisations as well, Diana was the only one who came in very close contact with the poor or sick. It was natural for her to hug or

kiss those people and she often visited or wrote to them regularly. Diana was furthermore concerned with the aid to people affected by AIDS. However, as Edwards states, also in this field she met with opposition of the members of the Royal Family. The entire Royal Family disassociated itself from the aid to those people because they were convinced that this disease was a consequence of their immoral lifestyle. Diana also helped overcome the prejudice that it was dangerous to touch people with AIDS (Edwards, 1995, p. 13). Diana's sympathy impressed many people all over the world.

Charles and Diana were divorced in August 1996 after a long period of mutual disputes and alienation. At that time Diana used her media popularity in a war against Charles. In various interviews she openly described her adversity and she also collaborated with the writer Andrew Morton on her autobiography called *Diana: Her True Story* which was, however, written very one-sidedly. Diana was soon perceived as a victim, as a young woman who was married to a man who did not love her and cheated on her, ignored and criticized by other members of the Royal Family, and after the divorce forced to renounce the HRH title. Although the information was frequently distorted, it damaged the reputation of the members of the Royal Family which was depicted as unfeeling, self-centred, and old-fashioned (Seward, 2004, pp. 189 and 204).

The situation became even tenser after Diana's sudden death on 30th August 1997. This incident "resulted in an outpouring of grief never before seen in the UK" (news.bbc.co.uk, 16.3.2012). Soon after the accident the Royal Family left London and settled at Balmoral Castle in Scotland. As Lacey (2003) describes: "not a public tear was shed [...] Elizabeth II's dislike of disclosing emotion, along with her mistrust of crowd pleasing, Diana-style gestures, froze the whole family in an appearance of apparent - and rather appalling - indifference" (p. 361). However this attitude proved unfortunate. As Craig (2003) notes, "the initial refusal of the royal family to participate in the commemoration of her death led to public anger, press criticism [...]" (p. 167). People also criticized the fact that there was no flag flying at half-mast at Buckingham Palace. After enormous pressure the Queen was forced to yield and she ordered to let the Royal Standard fly at half-mast. This had never happened before, even after the death of a sovereign. However, at that disturbed time the Queen consented to contravention of the protocol because of a woman who had caused many problems to the Royal Family.

The death of Princess Diana and the subsequent reaction of the Royal Family decreased the popularity of the Crown among people. Although the British were primarily known for their restraint, they suddenly openly expressed their sorrow at the death of this

“Queen of people’s hearts” (Gilchrist, 1998, p. 29). In fact, many British started to regard her as a sacred person (Watson, 1997, p. 6). The seclusion of the Royal Family was, therefore, regarded as an act of irreverence and this led to strong criticism among people. The Royal Family, which was too distant from London, and its rather conventional advisers tended to underestimate people’s reactions. However, the disgruntlement of the British should not have been underestimated and the Crown had to reconsider some of its principles. It had to change some of its traditions, curtail its strict adherence to the royal protocol and its expensive ceremonies, and try to get closer to common people. The death of Princess Diana, furthermore, evoked the question whether the means that the mass-media used were appropriate. However, one of Diana’s most significant legacies is the fact that she reignited interest in the British Royal Family.

Princess Diana, the “Royal rebel” (www.guardian.co.uk, 17.3.2012), was one of the most distinctive persons of the contemporary British monarchy. During her life she influenced not only many individuals but also the entire monarchy.

Diana began by bringing a breath of fresh air and a measure of glamour into the House of Windsor. But she became a sad figure to many as the story of her failed marriage unravelled. Her critics blamed her for helping to strip the monarchy of some of the mystique so important for its survival. But her strength of character in difficult personal circumstances and the unflagging support she gave to the sick and disadvantaged earned her continued respect. And, to the end, she remained a figure of public fascination and affection. (www.bbc.co.uk, 17.3.2012)

2.6 Republicanism in the British Monarchy

Although the history of the English monarchy is long, republican movements have occurred only seldom. As Cannadine (2004) asserts, “the British are deeply and abidingly and fundamentally loyal, so that republicanism has rarely been more than a fringe activity” (p. 311). Nevertheless, there have always been people who did not agree with this political system. However, they have always represented only a minority which could not threaten the existence of the British monarchy with such a long tradition and relatively stable development. During the reign of Queen Elizabeth II the tensest situation occurred after the death of Princess Diana but this crisis was also overcome without any grave consequences.

The principal arguments of supporters of a republic include primarily the assertion that the monarchy is obsolete and undemocratic. Not only is the head of state not elected but this political system also creates a social hierarchy in which some preferred individuals

are promoted over common people. Furthermore, it is claimed that the administration of the monarchy is too expensive and that the work and overseas travels of The Queen and of other members of the Royal Family are nowadays more or less meaningless. The republicans also frequently criticize the behaviour and scandals of primarily younger members of the Royal Family.

However, it is estimated that two-thirds of the British still commend their monarchy (Katwala, 2004, p. 17). They usually claim that the Queen represents a significant unifying element. She is considered to be a reminder of national pride and awareness and of the famous history of the United Kingdom. The non-partisan politics of the Queen also provides an indispensable stability. Since she has been involved the British politics her entire life, she is still esteemed for her views on various political matters. The whole Royal Family is also regarded as an important tourist allurements and furthermore it contributes to Britain by its charity work. Furthermore, the argument of republicans that a monarchy represents an undemocratic and inequitable political system does not automatically mean that such a system is bad. As Paxman (2007) stated, “many of the most stable societies in Europe are monarchies [such as Holland, Norway, Sweden, Belgium], while some of the most unstable and corrupt have presidents” (p. 288).

Whatever the arguments for and against, the fact is that if the British are asked whether Britain should become a republic, they usually answer *why?* (Matouš, 1970, p. 28). They are mostly satisfied with the way their country is managed. As Paxman (2007) adds, “Queen Elizabeth’s reign has seen a steady improvement in the living standards of her subjects; and when people are prosperous they do not seek change” (p. 286). Furthermore, there are always many more topical issues that have to be solved and that are more significant than the dissolution of the monarchy.

Many British also do not occupy themselves with the question of transformation of the British monarchy into a republic. They usually live their own lives and since there is no serious problem which would concern the Royal Family they have no intentions of becoming interested in these issues. They mostly consider the Queen only as an existing constituent of the United Kingdom but one which does not encroach on their everyday life. As has been noted:

The argument that the UK should abolish the Monarchy and become a republic remains at the fringes of mainstream political debate, partly because there is no alternative able to attract significant popular support. The political role of the

Monarchy is of little interest to much of the public, which largely regards the Royal Family as celebrities. (www.politics.co.uk, 25.3.2012)

Another fact that contributes to the preservation of the monarchy is its limited power. Many countries that were transformed into republics did so because their kings still disposed of substantial political powers. Since the Queen of England serves only as a representative figure with no actual powers, she cannot excessively intervene in British politics. Although the Queen can theoretically apply some of her remaining prerogatives, such as choosing the Prime Minister only by herself or refusing to pass a law, this situation would probably lead to strong criticism among the British. As Sandbrook (2010) suggests, “[British] royal family’s lack of political relevance is its greatest asset” (www.historyextra.com, 23.3.2012).

Although republicanism nowadays does not represent a serious threat to the British monarchy, the situation may change. The Crown enjoys considerable support largely thanks to its current sovereign: Queen Elizabeth II is popular and respected by many British. It is a question what will happen if Elizabeth’s successor does not gain similar regard among people or if there is a serious crisis in Britain. However, as Hunt (2011) claims, in any case the displeasure of the British with the Crown would have to occur suddenly and adds, “it would have to happen - as most royal denouements have - with speed, organization and conviction. A slow march towards republicanism is less probable” (p. 173).

2.7 Scandals of the Royal Family

Many British, and not only the supporters of a republic, often criticise the great number of various scandals of the members of the Royal Family. Nevertheless, this is not only a current problem: there have always been many disgraces related to the British royals in the past. However, nowadays the situation is aggravated by the mass media. As the mass media started to spread extensively and become a common part of many people’s lives, to be successful it endeavoured to bring still more topical and more shocking news. Therefore, it gradually started to gain its information without restraint. Scruples which formerly prevented journalists from interfering in the privacy of the sovereign or of other members of the Royal Family have disappeared.

There are several scandals that rank among the most serious affairs of the members of the current Royal Family. These include, for instance, divorces of three of Elizabeth II’s four children. The marriage of the Queen’s only daughter split in 1992 after the infidelity

of her husband. Much more negative attraction was aimed at the wife of Prince Andrew, Sarah Ferguson also known as Fergie. Public indignation and criticism were evoked primarily by her life style, namely her vulgar clothing, expensive travelling, neglect of her daughters and her royal duties, her infidelity, and her effort to earn money for herself and not for any charity. After the divorce in 1996 she endeavoured to pay her debts through various inferior interviews and advertisement. Furthermore, in 2010 she was revealed accepting money in exchange for a contact to Prince Andrew. Because of her scandals she was excluded from the Royal Family.

Nor have scandals avoided the life of Prince Charles. Primarily public media fights between him and Princess Diana attracted the attention of many British. Furthermore, in 1992 a secret recording was released which included a scandalous conversation between Charles and Camilla Parker Bowles and which became known as “Camillagate” or “tampongate”. Many current scandals have been related to Charles’s son, Prince Harry. He is notorious for his alcohol or marijuana experience and for occasional affrays. However, the strongest public criticism was evoked primarily after the publication of photographs showing him in a Nazi soldier uniform with a swastika armband at a Halloween party, or after a videotape was made public capturing the Prince while using several racist expressions.

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth II there have been many various scandals concerning either members of the Royal Family or employees of the Royal household. After all these grave excesses it was necessary to apologize to the public. Since the role of the current royals is primarily representative, these scandals often damage seriously their reputation. As Cannon and Griffiths (1988) states, “for royal advisers, the most awkward task is to strike some sort of balance between under- and over-exposure of the royal family. Criticism that the palace is too remote have to be set against warnings that the institution should not be exposed to the full glare of day” (p. 634).

2.8 Changes within the United Kingdom during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth II

During the 60-year reign of Queen Elizabeth II many significant alterations have occurred in the British monarchy. Some of them have been already mentioned, such as the final transformation of the British Empire into the British Commonwealth of Nations, changes in the taxation policy of the Queen, the beginning of the extensive dissemination of mass media and of their influence on people’s lives, or the impact of Princess Diana’s life and death on the monarchy. However, there are many other changes, both already

accomplished and others only prepared, which considerably influence the current character of the United Kingdom.

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth II the Crown gradually started to detract its elitism. Formerly, people who surrounded the Royal Family came mostly from elite families. However, younger members of the Royal Family tended to meet and work with people whom they like regardless of their pedigree but considering their qualities and work abilities. As Hunt (2011) remarks, “if the Prince can marry a commoner, then he can certainly start to surround himself with a few more different stripes” (p. 171). Progress also occurred in the area of education. While the Queen was still educated at home by private tutors, Prince Charles and his sons have already attended common schools. Abatement of the significance of the noble families furthermore affected the House of Lords. In 1958 the system of transfer the membership in the House of Lords to heirs was abolished. Late the twentieth century there was a tendency to dissolve the Upper House. However, the Queen was afraid that it could influence negatively the status of the whole monarchy. Finally, in 1999 a compromise was accepted, namely that only 92 hereditary Peers remained in the House of Lords and that they lost their voting right.

A reversal in the development of the current British monarchy occurred in 1992. The Queen herself refers to this year as to “*annus horibilis*”. It was enacted not only in token of disputes between Charles and Diana, the divorce of Princess Anne, and scandals of Fergie but also of a conflagration of Windsor Castle. The fire occurred on the 20th November 1992 and caused severe damage. The Queen was subsequently confronted with a strong criticism of the British who opposed the fact that the restoration of Windsor Castle was to be paid from state finances. The indignation of people led not only to the decision of Queen Elizabeth II to cover the costs on her own and to the, aforementioned, change of the Queen’s taxation system but also to other concessions. The Queen abjured using her private airlines and her royal yacht Britannia and also reduced the number of persons who were funded by the Civil List. Furthermore, for the first time the Buckingham Palace was opened to public, namely the State Rooms of the Buckingham Palace.

The United Kingdom under the reign of Queen Elizabeth II has also experienced significant changes concerning the succession law. These include the abolition of the act from 1701, which prevents a British sovereign from marrying a Catholic person, or of the precedence of male descendants in the line of succession. Both these rules were regarded as discriminating and contravening fundamental human rights. These changes of the succession rule were approved on 28th October 2011 and they will concern descendants of

Prince Charles and will not be applied retrospectively. Furthermore, several other changes involve the Church of England. On the one hand during the reign of Queen Elizabeth II it was for the first time after 450 years when a Pope visited Britain, namely Pope John Paul II in 1982; on the other hand there are proposals whether the British sovereign should not be deprived of the role of Head of the Church of England.

The contemporary world can be characterized as a time of rapid and incessant changes. Consequently, many modifications have affected the United Kingdom, as well. The monarchy under the reign of Queen Elizabeth II has had to transform itself to be able to survive in the modern world. Most of the changes have concerned a gradual shift towards a more democratic monarchy, which would also be closer to common people. Whether the executed and the intended modifications of the British Crown are sufficient for its endurance will be seen in the future.

2.9 The Future of the British Monarchy

While speaking about the future of the British monarchy, various speculation circulates among the British. The already aforementioned republicanism does not represent a topical threat to the existence of the Crown. Likewise, the claim that the British monarchy could transform into a Scandinavian-style monarchy seems rather improbable. In contrast to those civil sovereigns the Queen of England has also international obligations. The fact that she heads not only the United Kingdom but also several other countries in the Commonwealth, and the Commonwealth itself, more likely disqualifies this transformation. Nevertheless, while concerning the future of the United Kingdom, one significant question is often discussed, namely what will happen with the monarchy after the death of the current Queen Elizabeth II.

As the Queen indicates, she does not plan on retiring or abdicating the throne. She reveres the vows she made during her coronation and regards them as a life-long obligation (news.bbc.co.uk, 27.3.2012). Considering the fact that the Queen Mother lived to the age of 101, the appointment of a future successor to the British throne need not be topical for some time yet. However, even nowadays there are many surmises whether it will be Prince Charles or Prince William who becomes the King of England.

Although Prince Charles is the heir apparent to the English throne, many British are not sure whether he will succeed Queen Elizabeth II. Whilst the Queen is respected by the majority of the nation, the repute of Prince Charles was considerably damaged after his disputes and subsequent divorce with Princess Diana (Lloyd, 1996, p. 56). Furthermore,

Charles's second wife Camilla, who is quite unpopular among the British and who is often denoted as "the other woman" (www.luxemag.org, 30.3.2012), is not regarded as a suitable future British queen. Even the fact that a divorced person should become Head of the Church of England evokes contradictory opinions. Another disadvantage of Prince Charles is his age and rather outdated manners. Charles who was depicted as "very old-fashioned and out of time" (Scullion, 2011, p. 105) does not correspond to the ideas of a modern sovereign.

In contrast, Prince William enjoys considerable popularity among people and he is often described as "the perfect 21st-century king" (theweek.com, 30.3.2012). He is appreciated for his modern attitudes and for his closer relation to common people. His recent wedding to Kate Middleton has also awoken the interest of many people all over the world in the British monarchy. After many unsuccessful marriages in the Royal Family this event has also renewed the hope of many British for a fairy tale wedding and a happy married life. It is believed that the British monarchy should be modernized in the 21st century and that William and Kate could help considerably with this process (abcnews.go.com, 30.3.2012).

However, it is supposed that the official line of succession will be abided by and that Prince Charles as the heir apparent to the British throne will become its future sovereign. Since the monarchy is often appreciated for its respect for traditions, an intervention into the succession law might evoke questions concerning the logical continuity of the monarchy. Therefore, it is probable that Prince Charles will be the future King of England. Nevertheless, there is also a suggestion that Charles could reign for a shorter period of time and then that he could render the throne to his son (theweek.com, 30.3.2012).

While considering the development of the British monarchy in the 21st century, many uncorroborated projections appear. Although they often differ, many people agree that the monarchy, in whichever form, has its place in the 21st century as well. In a survey concerning the future of the British monarchy the historian Eric Hobsbawm encapsulates, "there is no reason to believe that constitutional monarchy will be less viable in the 21st century than in the 20th, when it proved to be the most reliable framework of liberal democratic states" (Tatchell, Byatt, & Eyre, 2009, p. 34). And Cannon and Griffiths (1988) add, „when one ponders how such disasters and misfortunes in the past have been overcome, there seems little reason to doubt the future of the monarchy today“ (p. 634).

3 RESEARCH

The practical part of this undergraduate thesis is comprised of a piece of research concerning the role of the British monarchy in the modern world. The questionnaire consists of 16 questions and it was posted on-line on a website of one company providing free opinion surveys. The link was dispensed with the help of Barry Jones, B.A., M.A., Cert Ed, among 50 native British of various gender, age, and educational level, in order to provide an objective view on this issue. The aim of this survey was to discover their attitude to the monarchy and their opinions on various aspects of this political system. The acquired data was subsequently compared with the general tendencies mentioned in the theoretical part of this thesis.

3.1 Results of the Research

Questions 1, 2, 3: gender, age, and an educational level of the respondents

1) Are you:		
	number of respondents	%
male	24	48 %
female	26	52 %

2) What is your age?		
	number of respondents	%
under 20	13	26 %
21 – 30	8	16 %
31 – 40	6	12 %
41 – 50	9	18 %
51 – 60	6	12 %
61 and over	8	16 %

3) What is your level of education?		
	number of respondents	%
junior high school	0	0 %
high school level	16	32 %
graduate	16	32 %
postgraduate	18	36 %
PhD.	0	0 %

The total number of respondents was 50. From these 24 persons (48 %) were male and 26 persons (52 %) were female. The majority of respondents was younger than 20 years, namely 13 persons (26 %), followed the age group of 41 - 50 years with 9 persons (18 %), then people of 21 - 30 years and older than 61 years, each with 8 persons (16 %), and the age groups of 31 - 40 and 51 - 60 were each represented by 6 persons (12 %). As regards the education, most people were postgraduate, namely 18 persons (36 %), followed high school level and graduates, each with 16 persons (32 %). Junior high school and PhD. level were not represented at all.

The questionnaire was planned to cover different sorts of people with approximately same number of respondents in order to avoid distortion. The intention was to provide general tendencies among the British and not to focus on comparison between various groups of people, such as the young and old etc.

Questions 4, 5, 6: an extent of the interest of the British in the matters concerning the Royal Family and the monarchy in general

4) Are you interested in the questions concerning the preservation of the British monarchy in the future?		
	number of respondents	%
yes, it is an important issue	15	30 %
I have never thought about it	11	22 %
no, there are many other problems that are more important	24	48 %

Almost half of the respondents, 24 persons (48 %), considered the question of the preservation of the British monarchy as not topical. In contrast, 15 persons (30 %) found

this issue significant, and 11 persons (22 %) had never applied themselves to contemplations about it.

These results express a relatively low interest of the British in the question of the future of the British monarchy. It corresponds with the previously mentioned assertion that there are no serious problems concerning the functioning of the monarchy, which would arouse public interest and requirements of a change.

5) Are you interested in the news concerning the Royal Family?		
	number of respondents	%
yes, I am interested in what is new in the Royal Family	8	16 %
I am interested in it only in brief	32	64 %
no, I am not interested in it at all	10	20 %

The majority of those interviewed, 32 persons (64 %), expressed a moderate interest in the information about the members of the Royal Family. In contrast, 10 persons (20 %) confessed that they did not search for the news about the Royal Family. Only 8 respondents (16 %) asserted that they found this topic very interesting.

These results are in accordance with the statement that although the British consider the Royal Family as an important part of the United Kingdom, they are more interested in the matters that concern their own everyday lives.

6) Do you think that the spectacular wedding of Prince William and Kate Middleton helped increase an interest in the monarchy and its popularity all over the world?		
	number of respondents	%
yes, the broadcast of the ceremony was watched by many people all over the world	42	84 %
I do not think that it would substantially increase the popularity of the monarchy	6	12 %
I think that more likely the pomposity of the ceremony did the monarch harm	2	4 %

The overwhelming majority of the respondents, namely 42 persons (84 %), held the opinion that the interest of various world mass media in the wedding of Prince William and Kate Middleton helped enhance the popularity of the British monarchy in the world. 6 persons (12 %) thought that this ceremony exerted no substantial influence over the

popularity of the United Kingdom. Only 2 interviewees (4 %) were convinced that the pompous wedding more likely attenuated the popularity of the monarchy in the world.

The responses support the assertion that at the time when the role of the royals is primarily representative, their popularity considerably depend on their media image and on the fact that they are seen.

Questions 7, 8: what influences the popularity of the Royal Family among people

7) In your opinion, who was (is) the greatest British monarch or member of the Royal Family (and why)?		
name of the mentioned royal	number of respondents	%
Elizabeth II	16	32 %
Elizabeth I	8	16 %
Princess Diana	5	10 %
Queen Victoria	4	8 %
Prince William	2	4 %
George VI	2	4 %
Edward I	2	4 %
Kate Middleton	1	2 %
Prince Harry	1	2 %
Henry VIII	1	2 %
Edward VIII	1	2 %
Alfred the Great	1	2 %
none	6	12 %

Question 7 was open and the respondents could state any royal, both from the past as well as from the present, they regarded as the greatest one, either with or without giving reasons why they chose exactly this person. The most frequently mentioned monarch was the current Queen Elizabeth II, namely 16 persons (32 %) selected her. These respondents primarily appreciated the way she had been discharging her not only royal but also international and family duties, her long reign characterized by prosperity and peace, her determination to serve her country as well as she could, or the fact that she preserved respect even at difficult times. The second most popular sovereign was Queen Elizabeth I chosen by 8 persons (16%). These people regarded her as a great and pragmatic

stateswoman, who proved that even a woman could be a successful monarch, who calmed religious conflicts in the country, defeated the Spanish Armada, and always preferred the interests of the country to her own. Princess Diana followed (5 respondents - 10 %), chosen because of her charity work and the fact that she approached the Crown to common people; then Queen Victoria (4 persons - 8 %); Prince William, selected by 2 persons (4 %) for his unpretentious, representative, and appropriately royal behaviour; George VI (2 respondents - 4 %), appreciated for his governance during the Second World War; Edward I (2 persons - 4 %); and then Prince Harry, Kate Middleton, King Henry VIII, King Edward VIII, and Alfred the Great, each mentioned by 1 respondent (2 %). 6 interviewees (12 %) did not appreciate any royal.

These results point to the frequently mentioned assertion that the popularity of the current British monarchy relies primarily on the person of Queen Elizabeth II. Although the respondents could select anyone of a large number of British royals, most of them decided for the current Queen of England. She embodies exactly that kind of a sovereign that people require at this time and that, therefore, could preserve the British monarchy also in the following years. Other qualities of British royals that people most frequently appreciate include primarily empathetic, unpretentious behaviour and the ability to face successfully even various difficult times.

8) In your opinion, which event had the most devastating effect on the popularity of the members of the Royal Family among people (and why)?		
mentioned event	number of respondents	%
treating with and death of Princess Diana	20	40 %
divorce and affairs of Prince Charles	12	24 %
abdication of Edward VIII	3	6 %
pompous royal weddings	3	6 %
divorces of Queen's children	2	4 %
Queen Victoria's long mourning	1	2 %
scandals of the members of the Royal Family	1	2 %
Prince Philip's inappropriate behaviour	1	2 %
Charles I's taxation policy	1	2 %
Mary I's intervention against the Protestants	1	2 %
unjust trials and executions of sovereigns' subjects in the past	1	2 %
None	4	8 %

Like the previous item, question number 8 was also open and the interviewees could select any event they wanted, either with or without clarifying why they decided in that way. 20 respondents (40 %), did not approve of the way the members of the Royal Family treated Princess Diana and how they reacted after her death. 12 persons (24 %) disliked the affairs that accompanied the divorce of Prince Charles and his relation with Camilla Parker-Bowles. 3 interviewees (6 %) criticized the exorbitant pomposity of royal weddings, and the same number of respondents (3 persons - 6 %) condemned the abdication of Edward VIII, who did not honour his obligations towards his country. 2 persons (4 %) resented the divorces of Queen Elizabeth II's children. Other events that were considered as adverse for the popularity of the British monarchy included often inappropriate behaviour of Prince Philip, many scandals of the members of the current Royal Family, the long seclusion of Queen Victoria, cruel reign of Mary I and of many previous sovereigns in general, and the taxation policy of Charles I, each mentioned by 1 respondent (2 %). 4 persons (8 %) did not specify any particular event that would significantly decrease the popularity of the British monarchy.

These responses correspond with the foregoing listing of the most criticized aspects concerning the British monarchy. The British usually resent it when the members of the Royal Family are too distant from common people, when they are insensitive,

unemotional, or too secluded. As representatives of the British nation they should be seen and sympathize with the emotions of common people. They should also avoid various scandals, which do not befit their worthy social status, restrict superfluous expenditures, and reverse the role that has been predestined for them.

Questions 9, 10: attitude of the British to the Queen

9) Do you know what nowadays exactly comes under the competence and duties of the Queen?		
	number of respondents	%
yes, I know all her duties and powers	6	12 %
I know most of her duties and powers	25	50 %
I know them only in brief	17	34 %
I have no idea about her duties and powers	2	4 %

Exactly half of the respondents, that is 25 persons (50 %), stated that they had relatively good knowledge about the duties and prerogatives of the current Queen. 6 persons (12 %) assumed that they knew all aspect concerning the reign of Queen Elizabeth II. 17 respondents (34 %) thought that they had only a rough overview of this matter and 2 persons (4 %) confessed that they had no idea about what the role of the British sovereign exactly included.

This suggests that although the Queen of England has nowadays almost no actual powers, the British are still aware of her duties and prerogatives, which has developed in the course of time, and of her role within the United Kingdom.

10) In your opinion, what is the most important contribution of the Queen to Britain?		
	number of respondents	%
the Queen helps preserve stability and national consciousness	24	48 %
the Queen represents an allurement for tourists from all over the world	16	32 %
the Queen still has a significant role in British politics	5	10 %
the Queen represents no contribution to Britain	2	4 %
some other contribution	3	6 %

Question 10 was designed to discover what the British appreciated most about their Queen. Almost half the respondents, namely 24 persons (48 %), acknowledged primarily the fact, that the Queen provided a sense of stability and national awareness. 16 persons (32 %) were convinced that the most significant contribution of the Queen was the money that she helped to gain from tourism. 5 respondents thought that the Queen still occupied an important position within the British politics, and only 2 persons (4 %) did not know any benefits that would result from the role of the Queen of England. 3 respondents (6 %) presented their own assets of the Queen, namely her international significance, her functioning as a non-partisan element, or as a symbol of the United Kingdom in the world.

Although the Queen of England does not have any significant actual powers any more, the British are still convinced that she contributes considerably to the good functioning of the country. That is also one of the reasons why many of the British do not feel any need to abolish the monarchy at all.

Questions 11, 12, 13: changes within the British monarchy

11) What do you think about the scandals and divorces of some members of the current Royal Family?		
	number of respondents	%
I do not like it, people of such a high social status should avoid scandals	18	36 %
I do not mind it, scandals and divorces became a common phenomenon today	19	38 %
I think that the scandals are often too exaggerated, especially in tabloids	13	26 %

The distribution of answers in question 11 was relatively even. 19 respondents (38 %) did not consider the various scandals and divorces within the Royal Family as some weighty or flagrant matter. Only 1 person fewer, that is 18 respondents (36 %), found such behaviour unacceptable by royals of such representative social status. 13 persons (26 %) thought that many of the scandals were not as serious as was depicted in the mass media, especially tabloids.

These responses do not support much the assertion that various scandals and divorces of the British Royal Family weaken its position. It seems that there are many people in the United Kingdom who accept such behaviour as an absolutely common and prevalent phenomenon in the current world, which even the royals cannot evade.

12) Should the members of the Royal Family approach more common people?		
	number of respondents	%
yes, it would help increase the popularity of the Royal Family among people	29	58 %
I think that their meeting with common people is sufficient	17	34 %
no, I think that common people do not long for meeting them	4	8 %

More than half of the respondents, exactly 29 persons (58 %), thought that the members of the Royal Family were too distant from common people and that they should endeavour to approach the British in order to increase the popularity of the monarchy. 17 interviewees (34 %) regarded the meeting of royals and common people as sufficient, and only 4 persons (8 %) held the opinion that the British would not wish to encounter the members of the Royal Family.

These results are primarily in concordance with the several times mentioned observations concerning the influence of Princess Diana on the British monarchy. As was stated, one of the most significant merits of Princess Diana was the fact that she considerably brought the Crown closer to common people. The British appreciated this development and, as the responses to this question imply, they would like this tendency to continue.

13) Do you agree with the complaint that some rules of the monarchy are discriminating and violate human rights? (for example, interdiction of a Catholic of becoming a king/queen, or precedence of male descendants in the throne succession,...)		
	number of respondents	%
yes, these rules should be changed	32	64 %
these rules might be a bit discriminating but it does not require a prompt change	14	28 %
no, I do not regard these rules discriminating	4	8 %

A significant majority of respondents, exactly 32 persons (64 %), regarded some of the principles of the British Crown as discriminating and violating human rights and required an alteration. 14 interviewees (28 %) found some of the rules inconvenient for the declaration of the fundamental human rights; however, they did not feel any urgent need to change them. Only 4 persons (8 %) did not consider these principles as questionable at all.

These responses correspond exactly with the current tendencies within the British monarchy. Recently, it was approved in the United Kingdom that some of the obsolete principles of the British Crown should be altered in order to adapt the monarchy to modern democratic times.

Questions 14, 15, 16: future of the British monarchy

14) Do you think that there is still place for a monarchy in the modern world?		
	number of respondents	%
yes	29	58 %
no	6	12 %
yes, but only on the assumption that some changes will be made	15	30 %

A majority of respondents, namely 29 persons (58 %), were convinced that the monarchy could function well even in the modern world. Only 6 persons (12 %) regarded the monarchy as unfit for the present. 15 respondents (30 %) would maintain the monarchy but expressed a necessity of an execution of some changes. The most frequently suggested improvements included a more thrifty economy of the Crown, a full tax for the Queen, and a weakening of the celebrity-like status of the members of the Royal Family. These responds affirm the foregoing listing of the most criticized aspects of the governance of the British monarchy.

As the responses suggest most of the British think that the monarchy, either in the current shape or rather altered, could exist even in the 21st century.

15) Do you mind that there is still aristocracy in the modern world?		
	number of respondents	%
yes, it should not exist in the modern democratic world	26	52 %
I consider it a bit old-fashioned	12	24 %
I do not mind it	10	20 %
I like it, it is an interesting survival from the past	2	4 %

Approximately half of the interviewees, 26 persons (52 %), would abolish the aristocratic system in the modern world. 12 persons (24 %) regarded the aristocracy as rather obsolete but they did not require any change. 10 respondents (20 %) did not mind the existence of the aristocracy in the contemporary world and 2 persons (4 %) even considered it as a nice tradition from the past.

Although most of the British would maintain the monarchy even in the 21st century, many of them at the same time do not approve of the aristocratic system, which elevates some people over others only because of their birth. As the results of this question indicate, it would be better if the nobility was curtailed to some extent.

16) Could you imagine that the British monarchy would be transformed into a republic?		
	number of respondents	%
yes, it would be a welcome change	11	22 %
no, because it would be a too serious intervention into the British political system	11	22 %
no, because there are no reasons for this change	19	38 %
no, because Britain would lose its unique prestige which it has in the world	9	18 %

Most of the respondents were convinced that the British monarchy should not transform itself into a republic but their reasons differed. 19 interviewees (38 %) wished no change because they thought that there were no reasons for it. 11 respondents (22 %) held the view that such a transformation would represent a too difficult intervention into the entire politics of Britain. 9 persons (18 %) were afraid that as a republic the United Kingdom would lose its uniqueness within the world. Only 11 respondents (22 %) expressed a request for transformation of Great Britain into a republic.

The responses support the statement that there is only a negligible republicanism in the United Kingdom. Although the British may have various reasons for maintaining their monarchy, the fact is that most of them would still retain it even in the 21st century.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this undergraduate thesis was to discover whether the British monarchy could function well even in the 21st century and in what shape it would alternatively exist. The findings of this work are based not only on perusing various theoretical materials but also on executing an own survey.

The British monarchy has already survived for more than 1,500 years. In the course of time it had to cope with various difficulties and adapt itself to fast-changing requirements of particular eras. The role of the English royals has altered as well: while initially English sovereigns were primarily brave warriors and respected leaders of several minor kingdoms, nowadays they hold the post of representatives of the nation and of famous celebrities. Although the form of the British monarchy has transformed, it still occupies a significant role not only within the United Kingdom but also within the entire world.

The United Kingdom faces now the 21st century and as it has been suggested there is no reason to doubt the ability of the British Crown to maintain itself even at this time. Although several changes should be executed, the British monarchy has good prerequisites for the continuation of its long history. One of the main tasks of the Crown in the new century is to modernise itself, however, without losing its mystique, which is necessary for the existence of any monarchy. Concerning individual members of the British Royal Family, they should endeavour to meet frequently even contradictory demands of the British on a common, amiable, modest, but at the same time representative, creditable and distinguished royal. In this condition, and if there is no serious crisis in Great Britain, the monarchy could endure for a long time yet.

Any predictions of the future of the British monarchy are certainly only speculation. It is impossible to say what exactly happens in the following years. The wishes of people could change. Although the Crown nowadays enjoys considerable support of the British, in a few years they may require a transformation of their monarchy into a republic. However, from the objective point of view it is necessary to remark that there are no reasons why a monarchy should not exist even in the modern democratic world.

REFERENCES

- ABC News (2011, April 18). Royal wedding: The future of the British monarchy. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from http://abcnews.go.com/International/Royal_Wedding/royal-wedding-prince-william-kate-middleton-future-british/story?id=13399829#.T3WEgTEaNUN
- Ali, M. (2011, March 30). Royal rebel: the legacy of Diana. Retrieved March 17, 2012 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2011/mar/30/diana-princess-wales-royal-rebel-legacy>
- BBC (2006, April 19). Queen 'will do her job for life'. Retrieved March 27, 2012 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4921120.stm
- BBC. The life of Diana, Princess of Wales. Retrieved March 17, 2012 from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/special/politics97/diana/ob-divorce.html>
- Burgess, G. (1992). The divine right of kings reconsidered. *The English Historical Review*, 107(425), 837-861.
- Cannadine, D. (2004). From biography to history: writing the modern British monarchy. *Historical Research*, 77(197), 289-312.
- Cannon, J. A., & Griffiths, R. A. (1988). *The Oxford illustrated history of the British monarchy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Craig, D. M. (2003). The crowned republic? Monarchy and anti-monarchy in Britain, 1760 - 1904. *The Historical Journal*, 46(1), 167-185.
- Daly, J. (1978). The idea of absolute monarchy in seventeenth-century England. *The Historical Journal*, 21(2), 227-250.
- Drake, G. (1966). The ideology of Oliver Cromwell. *Church History*, 35(3), 259-272.
- Edwards, A. (1995). *Lady Diana: Diana, královská rodina a já*. Plzeň: Mustang.
- Elton, G. (2000). *Angličané*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Encyclopædia Britannica. Retrieved March 6, 2012 from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/689632/constitutional-monarchy>
Retrieved March 7, 2012 from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/128916/Commonwealth>
- Encyclopedia of World Biography. Oliver Cromwell biography. Retrieved April 14, 2012 from <http://www.notablebiographies.com/Co-Da/Cromwell-Oliver.html>
- Feguson, N. (2007). *Britské impérium - Cesta k modernímu světu*. Praha: Prostor.
- Gilchrist, C. (1998). *Princess Diana*. London: Penguin Books.

- Halliday, F. E. (1995). *England: A concise history*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Halme, O. (2011). *A view on the British constitutional monarchy from Magna Carta to the 21st century: an essay*. Retrieved August 8, 2011 from http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/300/ossi_halme/view/ISBN9789529290260.pdf
- Helmholz, R. H. (1999). Magna Carta and the ius commune. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 66(2), 297-371.
- Hunt, T. (2011). Monarchy in the UK. *Public Policy Research*. Published March 2, 2011. 167-174.
- Jones, B., & Kavanagh, D. (1991). *British politics today*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Katwala, S. (2004). Comment & analysis: Royalty for grown-ups: an open debate on reforming the monarchy is vital for a modern Britain. *The Guardian*, Jan 5 2004, p. 17.
- Keir, D. L. (1966). *The Constitutional history of modern Britain since 1485*. London: Adam and Charles Black.
- Lacey, R. (2003). *Monarch: the life and reign of Elizabeth II*. New York: Free Press.
- Lloyd, J. (1996). Komu královna předá trůn. *Týden*, 3(13), 54-56.
- Luxury Magazine* (2011, April 14). Camilla Parker Bowles: Second to none. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://www.luxemag.org/jet-set/camilla-parker-bowles.html>
- Matouš, J. (1970). *Králové, vévodové, knížata*. Praha: Horizont.
- Maurois, A. (1993). *Dějiny Anglie*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny.
- Morrison, J. (2009). *Public affairs for journalists*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Painter, S. (1947). Magna Carta. *The American Historical Review*, 53(1), 42-49.
- Parker, J. (1996). *Královna*. Praha: Ivo Železný.
- Paxman, J. (2007). *On royalty*. London: Penguin Books.
- People Magazine* (2011, March 30). Diana Remembered. Retrieved March 14, 2012 from <http://www.people.com/people/static/h/package/dianaremembered/>
- Plant, D. (2008). The Grand Remonstrance 1641. Retrieved February 5, 2012 from <http://www.british-civil-wars.co.uk/glossary/grand-remonstrance.htm>
- Politics. Monarchy. Retrieved March 25, 2012 from <http://www.politics.co.uk/reference/monarchy/>
- Rabley, S. (1990). *The British Royal Family: the Windsors at work, the prince and princess of Wales, palaces and castles, the monarch and the media, royal traditions, kings and queens of the past*. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Limited.

- Rovná, L. A. (2004). *Kdo vládne Británii*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství (Slon).
- Sandbrook, D. (2010). British monarchy: Will it continue to endure? *BBC History Magazine*. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.historyextra.com/blog/british-monarchy-will-it-continue-endure>
- Scullion, D. (2011). The Prince of Wales and The Duke of Cambridge: A Constitutional Analysis. *Aberdeen Student Law Review*. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/law/aslr/Volume2Issue1/ThePrinceofWales.pdf>
- Seward, I. (2004). *Královna & Diana*. Praha: BB/art.
- Slaughter, T. P. (1981). 'Abdicate' and 'Contract' in the Glorious Revolution. *The Historical Journal*, 24(2), 323-337.
- Tatchell, P., Byatt, A.S., & Eyre, R. (2009). Does the monarch still matter? *New Statesman*, 138(4957), 34-35.
- The Glorious Revolution and the English Bill of Rights. Retrieved February 8, 2012 from http://www.international.ucla.edu/cms/files/Revolution_English%20Bill%20of%20Rights.pdf
- The official website of The British Monarchy. Retrieved February 1, 2012 from <http://www.royal.gov.uk/HistoryoftheMonarchy/KingsandQueensofEngland/TheTudors/MaryI.aspx>
Retrieved March 7, 2012 from <http://www.royal.gov.uk/CharitiesandPatronages/Royal%20involvement%20with%20charities/Royal%20involvement%20with%20charities.aspx>
Retrieved March 20, 2012 from <http://www.royal.gov.uk/LatestNewsandDiary/Factfiles/80factsaboutTheQueen.aspx>
- The Official Website of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Retrieved January 30, 2012 from <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/originsofparliament/birthofparliament/overview/firsteparliaments/>
Retrieved February 4, 2012 from <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/parliamentaryauthority/civilwar/overview/petition-of-right/>
Retrieved February 4, 2012 from <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/parliamentaryauthority/civilwar/overview/longparliament/>

- The Week* (2011, April 27). Should Prince William get a fast track to the throne? Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://theweek.com/article/index/214648/should-prince-william-get-a-fast-track-to-the-throne>
- Turner, E.R. (1913). The development of the Cabinet, 1688-1760. *The American Historical Review*, 18(4), 751-768.
- Vallance, E. (2011). The Glorious Revolution. Retrieved February 7, 2012 from http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/civil_war_revolution/glorious_revolution_01.shtml
- VisitBritain. Visitor Economy Facts - Updated July 2011. Retrieved February 29, 2012 from <http://www.visitbritain.org/insightsandstatistics/visitoreconomyfacts/index.aspx>
- Vodička, P. (2005). Koruna versus parlament. *Historický obzor*, 16(9/10), 194-204.
- Watson, C. W. (1997). 'Born a lady, became a princess, died a saint': The reaction to the death of Diana, Princess of Wales. *Anthropology Today*, 13(6), 3-7.

SUMMARY IN CZECH

Tématem této bakalářské práce je role britské monarchie v 21. století. Spojené království se významně podílelo na utváření lidských dějin. A přestože je toto politické zřízení víceméně založeno na principech, které jsou v rozporu s požadavky moderního světa, jako například nevolení hlavy státu, privilegované postavení určitých jedinců získané dědičně a nikoliv podle zásluh, či dotování jejich života ze státních daní, zdá se, že mnozí stále nedají na tento přežitek z minulosti dopustit. Cílem této bakalářské práce je zjistit, zda má britská monarchie předpoklady pro to, aby přetrvala i ve století jednadvacátém. A pokud ano, jakými změnami je pokračování její existence podmíněno.

Bakalářská práce je rozdělena na tři hlavní části. První část je věnována historii Spojeného království. Jelikož byla současná podoba monarchie utvářena postupně, vlivem mnoha rozličných historických událostí, je nutné zaměřit se i na toto téma. Bližší prozkoumání dějin tohoto národa může napovědět nejen to, proč se britská monarchie zachovala do dnešní doby, i když mnohá další království v průběhu staletí zanikla, ale také může objasnit, co pro Brity jejich monarchie znamená a za jakých okolností by byli ochotni se jí zříci.

Druhá část této bakalářské práce se zabývá charakteristikou současného Spojeného království. Jsou zde rozebrány jak jednotlivé aspekty týkající se britské královské rodiny a britské monarchie obecně, tak i údaje z aktuálních statistik, které se zabývají oblibou Koruny mezi Brity. Pozornost je věnována zejména několika významným událostem, které se odehrály za vlády současné královny Alžběty II. a které měly značný dopad na postoj Britů vůči jejich monarchii. Závěrem je zde také snaha alespoň trochu nastínit možný následující vývoj Spojeného království.

Poslední část je zaměřena na analyzování poznatků získaných v rámci on-line dotazníku, který byl určen rodilým Britům a ve kterém se vyjadřovali na problematiku zachování britské monarchie i pro další století. Odpovědi byly vyhodnoceny a porovnány s poznatky a obecnými tendencemi uvedenými v teoretické části této bakalářské práce. Tento výzkum sloužil především pro podpoření, či naopak vyvrácení, těchto tvrzení, díky čemuž bylo možné dojít k vědecky podloženému závěru.